

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XI.

APRIL, 1907.

No. 2.

EVIDENCE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE LORD.

(By request.)

The faith of Christendom is found ultimately to rest upon a single miracle. Christians themselves are taught to stake all on this miracle: "If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, your faith also is vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ: whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished." 1 Cor. 15, 14—18. Thus Paul. This is not hyperbole.

Facts of sacred history show that the supreme importance of the resurrection of the Lord was recognized not only in verbal statement, but in the entire activity of the early Church. In the same chapter from which we have just quoted Paul sketches in a few lines the essentials of apostolic preaching. He states, v. 1: "I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received," etc.; and then proceeds in vv. 3. 4 to say: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures." Peter's Pentecostal oration, the first public effort of an evangelical preacher in the New Testament, states, and proves by means of Old Testament

prophecy, the fact of the Lord's resurrection, Acts 2, 22—32. Peter's second recorded oration in Solomon's porch treats the resurrection of the Lord, Acts 3, 14. 15. The first persecution of the Church by the Jewish Sanhedrin aimed at the suppression of this preaching of the risen Christ, Acts 4. Twice in quick succession Peter and John defended the Lord's resurrection in the teeth of the high priests, and at their second confession of this miracle they had just been brought from prison, nothing daunted by the threatening of the men who had crucified their Lord, and might be permitted to crucify them also. Philip declared the name of Jesus in Samaria, explained the suffering and glory of Christ to the eunuch. But why multiply instances? The preaching of the risen Lord was the stereotype message of the apostles in every part of the then known earth. That is the marrow and substance of the Gospel: Christ is risen from the dead!

Again, in Rom. 10, 9 Paul has reduced the faith which Christians profess to its briefest expression. "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." He impresses upon Timothy, as a sacred duty, this: "Remember that Jesus Christ of the seed of David was raised from the dead according to my Gospel," 2 Tim. 2, 8. That is the sweet kernel of all Christian faith and profession: "I know that my Redeemer liveth!"

Again, the resurrection of the Lord in the theology of the apostles represents not only the basis of their dogmatics, but also of their ethics. The daily life of Christians has its moral fundament in, draws its moral strength from, patterns its spiritual renewal after, the resurrection of the Lord. To quote a single passage out of many, Paul says: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the like-

ness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once: but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof," Rom. 6, 3—12. That is the crown and glory of a truly Christian life, viz., that it is being transfigured into the glory of the risen Lord by daily rising from sin.

Again, the resurrection of the Lord is the secret of the courage of Christian martyrs. "I see the heavens open and the Son of Man standing at the right hand!" Acts 7, 56 — this cry of the protomartyr of our faith has been ringing down the centuries. Robert Turnbull in his "Christ in History" portrays the power of resurrection-faith from Ireneus, Polycarp, and Justin to Luther and to the nineteenth century. (pp. 346—473.) It is a noble account, this tale of the cloud of blood-witnesses for the despised Galilean whose praises are sung in mortal agony, rising triumphant above the crackling of devouring flames, the howls of wild beasts and the frenzied shouts of still wilder men. That is the mighty stimulus of Christian martyrdom: "I have fought a good fight; henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness which He shall give me who said: I live and ye shall also live! I go to prepare a place for you!"

Again, the resurrection of the Lord has given color and character to the public acts of Christian worship. The Lord's Day, the day when God brought again from the dead the great Shepherd of the sheep, stands like a benediction at the entrance of our weeks of toil and worry. The Lord's Gospel sheds its

health-giving rays from every Sunday morn to Saturday night. Every new week is placed afresh under Easterly influences. Christian Passover, *i. e.*, Easter, came to be celebrated quite a while before the Church celebrated Christmas. The feast of the resurrection was the keystone in the arch of annually recurring church-festivals.

Briefly, then, we may say with Uhlhorn: "From whatever side we may view life in the oldest Christian congregations, again and again we meet with this living faith in the resurrection as its moving and propelling force." (*Aufersteh. Chr. als heilsgesch. Tats.*, p. 182.)

Yes, such is the importance of the Lord's resurrection. We fully agree to the statement of Quenstedt and Gerhard: "Resurrectio Christi est basis et fundamentum omnium fidei articulorum." (Qu., *Theol. d.-p.* II, p. 376. Gerh., *Harm.*, C. 212.) And we fail to understand how a theologian like Steinmeyer (*Aufersteh.-Gesch.*, p. 3 f.) can minimize the importance of the resurrection for the Christian apologist, or how a type of theologians, the school of Schleiermacher, can blandly propose to discard the resurrection of the Lord as a myth, and declare: It does not matter much whether Jesus rose or not. Christianity will continue to exist, independently of belief in the reality of His resurrection.

Alas, that theologians of the negative school have been quicker to see the overshadowing importance of the Lord's resurrection. Strauss has made statements to which believers affix their devout Amen. *E. g.*: "The resurrection of Jesus represents the center of the center, the real heart of conventional Christianity, and it is for this reason that the keenest missiles of opponents have at all times been aimed against it." (*Halb. u. Ganz.*, p. 125.) "We are here facing the point where the decision must come; where we must either retract all our former claims and abandon our whole undertaking, or must come forward with the offer to explain the origin of the belief in the resurrection of Jesus without a corresponding miraculous fact." (*Leb. Jes.*, p. 288.) He calls the resurrection of the Lord "an

unheard-of event, an event without a parallel," and declares that "in the face of this event the question whether miracles are at all possible pales into utter insignificance." (*Halb. u. Ganz.*, p. 125.) In a lecture on the resurrection of Christ, delivered at Hildesheim, Uhlhorn's opening remarks were: "I am placed opposite to that point in the great conflict which in our day is being waged about the fundamental articles of the Christian faith, where the strife at this moment is hottest. Having first become concentrated about the person and life of Jesus, the conflict now turns upon Jesus' resurrection. Both parties feel that the decision must come at this point." (*Auferst.-Gesch.*, p. 177.) And Pressense has correctly stated: "If the resurrection cannot stand as an integral part of Christianity, it is not worth while to talk about the remainder." (*Ibid.*, p. 216.)

Such is the importance of this miracle of the Lord's resurrection, as acknowledged by friend and foe of Christ. Now, it is true that we are here dealing with a miracle, something that will prepossess the skeptically inclined against the truth of the resurrection. They spurn miracles, and an event based on, or accompanied by, miracles is at once placed under suspicion by them. The average skeptic is never a good pupil. He lacks that passiveness which is necessary for the successful impartation of knowledge. He is ever on the alert to discover fraud and imposition. His attitude is defiant. He seems to say: Convince me, if you dare! He does not say: Pray teach me! He is biased. His mind is preoccupied and prepossessed. His receptivity is limited. He only accepts what he cannot well afford to decline. He may be silenced and cowed by a presentation of truth, but in his heart of hearts lurks the wish that he might have had the better of the argument. He may acknowledge the victory of truth, however, with a keen regret over his own discomfiture.

The skeptic is usually a bad historian. History is the study of known facts, together with their known consequences. It is occupied with these two questions: 1. What has happened? 2. What came of it? Within these limits history gives an ac-

count of events on the basis of cause and effect. The historian cannot go behind the facts. He cannot undertake to explain the cause of the cause. He must not question the reality of an occurrence on the ground of its incomprehensibility. The historian does not care to know whether anything could have happened, but only whether it did happen. In the address already referred to, Uhlhorn says: "Indeed, I am well aware that the claim is set up in many quarters that the only method truly historical is to absolutely exclude the acceptance of miracles. For, it is said, miracles are inexplicable, are matters which cannot be comprehended from the natural connection of cause and effect, and hence, they cannot form the subject-matter of historical research. Just as if history were able in every instance to pursue its subjects to their primal base and beginning, and to show, in every instance, a perfect chain of cause and effect! The fact that miracles cannot be explained does not exclude them from the consideration of the historian; from such consideration they would be excluded only if they were unknowable. But they are not unknowable; for, although miracles are themselves effects of a higher cause, still, being something that is caused, they readily enter into the natural connection of cause and effect, and are, in their turn, governed as to their effects and consequences by natural laws just as any other fact. However, if miracles are knowable as far as they are facts, they are also subject-matter for historical research, for history deals with facts. It is not from a desire to be historically unprejudiced that miracles are excluded, but from dogmatic bias. A person approaches historical investigation without prejudice when he calmly waits to see whether a strictly historical research will yield facts which, to our conception, are miracles. From the standpoint of the historian I can acknowledge as just this demand only, viz., that whenever we have to do with facts out of the ordinary course of affairs, we must institute a more earnest and searching examination and cross-examination of the witnesses." (*Aufersteh.*, etc., p. 180 f.) Again, this same authority says: "An historical fact cannot be proved except by historical

testimony, nor can it be set aside on any other ground. It can neither be proved on common grounds of reasonableness when historical testimonies for its actual occurrence are wanting, nor can it be set aside on such grounds, if these testimonies are available in sufficient force." (*Ibid.*, p. 179.) This argument has been employed with telling effect in behalf of the fact of our Lord's resurrection by Dr. Paley. He writes: "The history of the resurrection of Christ is a part of the evidence of Christianity: but I do not know whether the proper strength of this passage of the Christian history, or wherein its peculiar value, as a head of evidence, consists, be generally understood. It is not that, as a miracle, the resurrection ought to be accounted a more decisive proof of supernatural agency than other miracles are; it is not that, as it stands in the Gospels, it is better attested than some others; it is not, for either of these reasons, that more weight belongs to it than to other miracles; but for the following, viz.: That it is completely certain that the apostles of Christ, and the first teachers of Christianity, asserted the fact. And this would have been certain, if the four Gospels would have been lost, or never written. Every piece of Scripture recognizes the resurrection. Every epistle of every apostle; every author contemporary with the apostles; of the age immediately succeeding the apostles; every writing from that age to the present, genuine or spurious, on the side of Christianity or against it; concur in representing the resurrection of Christ as an article of his history, received without doubt or disagreement by all who called themselves Christians, as alleged from the beginning by the propagators of the institution, and alleged as the center of their testimony. Nothing, I apprehend, which a man does not himself see or hear, can be more certain to him than this point. I do not mean that nothing can be more certain than that Christ rose from the dead; but that nothing can be more certain than that His apostles, and the first teachers of Christianity, gave out that He did so. In the other parts of the Gospel narrative, a question may be made, whether the things related of Christ be the very things which the apostles

and first teachers of the religion delivered concerning Him. And this question depends a good deal upon the evidence we possess of the genuineness, or rather, perhaps, of the antiquity, credit, and reception of the books. On the subject of the resurrection no such discussion is necessary, because no such doubt can be entertained. The only points which can enter into our consideration are, whether the apostles knowingly published a falsehood, or whether they were themselves deceived; whether either of these suppositions be possible." (*Evid. of Christianity* III, 301 f.) And Dean Milman, in his way, acknowledges the same, when he says: "History, to be true, must condescend to speak the language of the legend. The belief of the times is part of the record of the times; and though there may occur what may baffle its more calm and searching philosophy, it must not disdain that which was the primal, almost universal, motive of human life." (*Lat. Christianity* I, 388.)

The resurrection of Christ is more than an event of history; it is the epochal event without parallel. It is the point where ancient history ends and modern history begins. It is the turning point in the life of the race. It is not possible to ignore this event. He has not read history at all who assumes to pass over this event, claiming that it is of no moment. Voices from all lands under the sun, from every archive of the past accessible to us, say, after the year 70 p. Chr., do not whisper, hint at, suggest, but cry aloud and shout: He is risen! He must be deaf and blind who has failed to perceive this. To understand present conditions in this world of men without accepting the resurrection of Christ as a fact, necessitates the assumption of a greater miracle than the one which skepticism rejects. Jerome quoting Eusebius says: "Do you believe that rustic fishermen from a hamlet . . . conceived the idea of going out to the world — without literary ability, the illiterate to the refined, the ignoble to the skilled? Consider the abject state, low social rank, the absence of learning, the poverty, and the small number of these preachers." (*Lardner's Works* IV, 79.) Chrysostom is astonished, "That a few men, some fishermen,

another a publican, all illiterate, and destitute of worldly wealth and authority, should prevail over both living and dead, and bring over to their scheme not one, or two, or twenty men, or a hundred, or a thousand, or ten thousand, but cities, and nations, and people." (*Hom. in Matth.* 1. See Lardner IV, 563.) At another time he rises to declare: "For the Christian religion to have been spread over the world without miracles, would be a greater miracle than any recorded in the New Testament. If He had not risen, there would not have been any miracles wrought in testimony to it; nor would any have been able to work any miracles in His name: whereas the same power wrought miracles before and after His crucifixion, yea, more and greater after it than before. But how does it appear that miracles were wrought then? will an infidel say. From whence does it appear that Christ was crucified? From the Holy Scriptures, he will answer. Well, that miracles were then done, and that Christ was crucified is manifest from the Holy Scriptures; for they relate both the one and the other. And if the adversary should say that the apostles wrought no miracles, it may be replied: You make their power and the divine favor greater, if indeed, without miracles, they allured so large a part of the world to true religion. For that would be the greatest and most wonderful miracle of all that a company of twelve men, poor, mean, illiterate, despicable, should draw over to themselves so many cities, and nations, and people, and kings, and tyrants, and philosophers, and rhetoricians, and, in a word, the whole earth, without working any miracles. But do you expect to see miracles done now? I will show you some, and greater than any that are recorded: not one dead man raised to life, not one blind man restored to sight, but the whole earth recovered from the darkness of error; not one leper cleansed, but many nations washed from the leprosy of sin. What miracle dost thou desire, man, beyond this great change made in the world all on a sudden?" (*In Princ. Art.* H. 4. T. III, p. 92. 93. See Lardner, IV, 563 f.)

In order to study the evidence of the resurrection of our

Lord with any degree of satisfaction to ourselves, and so as to enable us to readily discover the vulnerable points in any skeptic argument which may be advanced against it, we will have to be thoroughly familiar with the account of the witnesses of that event. Before we weigh testimony, we must have a complete knowledge of the testimony. I shall, accordingly, begin by telling the Easter story in chronological order from the harmonized narrative of the four Gospels and collateral texts.

Loving hands had entombed the Lord in the garden of Joseph of Arimathea, and had shut the entrance to the sepulcher with a huge stone. That was in the late afternoon of Friday. That night, Friday night, the garden was forsaken. No human being was left near the tomb. Friday night passed, and Saturday morning dawned, when, behold, a delegation of Jewish church dignitaries wend their way up the steps to the governor's palace. Matthew relates (ch. 27, 62—66): "Now the next day, that followed the day of the preparation, the chief priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulcher be made sure until the third day, lest His disciples come by night, and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulcher sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch."

Lardner accounts for the fact that the Jews did not procure the guard on Friday in the following manner: "The priests and Pharisees did not go to Pilate till the next day, or the morrow after our Savior's crucifixion and burial. And there are obvious reasons for such delay. The day in which our Lord was crucified had been a day of full employment and great perplexity to Pilate. And the Jewish priests and Pharisees might not judge it convenient to disturb him in the evening of it. Possibly this thought of a guard, to watch the sepulcher, came not into the minds of any of them that evening. Whenever the

thought arose in the minds of one, or two, or some few of them, it would require time to propose it to others, and gather them together, to go with the request to Pilate. And the morning of the next day was soon enough. For they could none of them suspect the disciples to be so horribly profane and desperate, as to attempt to remove a dead body on the Sabbath! They therefore made provision against the night that followed after the Sabbath. Which was all that could be reckoned needful in the opinion of the most suspicious. Indeed, it is not easily supposable that any of those Jews did really suspect the disciples of a design to steal the body. But they were willing to cast upon them the scandal of such a supposition, the more to bring them under popular resentment. But the contrivance turned out to their own disadvantage." (X, 354.) He also cites Grotius: "The council could not sit on that day. But after a private consultation some of the priests and elders of the sect of the Pharisees went to Pilate, as if they had somewhat to say to him of the utmost importance. Nor had they much difficulty to obtain from him what he regarded of no consequence." (Grotius in Matt. 27, 62. See Lardner, X, 356 f.)

Meanwhile the disciples had disappeared. They were in hiding, partly from shame, partly from fear. But a few of the female followers of the Lord were anxiously waiting for the passing of the Sabbath which kept them indoors and from all manual labor, Luke 23, 56, in order that they might go and embalm the body of Christ. The dawn of the first day of the week was just creeping up from the east, but it was still dark, when a company of women, the two Galilean Marys, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James, and certain others, among whom were Salome and Joanna, started for the sepulcher, bringing spices and ointments which they had prepared after returning from the burial on Friday, Luke 23, 56; 24, 1, and which they had in part purchased that very morning, Mark 16, 1. They were not aware of the action taken by the Jewish church council on the preceding day, viz., of the sealing of the stone, and the posting of the Roman guard. Had they known this,

it is likely they should not have ventured forth. Their only concern, as they were walking toward the grave, was the removal of the huge stone, Mark 16, 3. That threatened to baffle their effort.

However, great things had meanwhile transpired at the sepulcher of the Lord, or were just then transpiring. A great earthquake shook the region,—it matters little whether *σεισμός ἐγένετο μέγας* in Matthew be understood as, in effect, the pluperfect or as the imperfect tense. If the women, as Meyer claims, were eye-witnesses of the phenomenon, the discovery which they made only served to hasten their steps towards the tomb. They beheld, from a distance, that the stone had been dislodged. Being of huge size it could be easily discerned at a considerable distance. Mary Magdalene, it appears, no sooner noticed the removal of the stone than she hurried back to the city to bring the report to Peter and John. No doubt, she believed that some harm had been done to the Lord's body, perhaps grave-robbery had been committed.

Meanwhile messengers of another sort were speeding toward the city: the Roman guard. They had been dazed, not only by the earthquake shock, but still more by the apparition of a gorgeous angel who had rolled the stone from the mouth of the tomb and had sat upon it. From this vision the guard ran, as soon as they had recovered themselves. Their destination was the Jewish church council. Thus the news of the resurrection must have reached the friends and foes of Christ at about the same time. After the flight of the guard the angel took up a position in the grave. There was a companion with him, whom Luke and John mention, but whom the women seem not to have discovered at first. The nearer angel addressed the women in the words recorded by Matthew and Mark when they had reached the grave. Calming their fears, he breaks to them the Easter news, and his companion joins him. The women are invited to inspect the place where their Lord had been laid, and which they had marked sadly on the preceding Friday evening. With greetings to the brethren, particularly to penitent Peter,

and with the injunction to meet Christ in Galilee, the angels dismiss the women. Meantime Mary Magdalene has returned, accompanying John and Peter who had decided to investigate the state of affairs at the tomb. Neither of them believed that a resurrection had taken place. John outran Peter on their way to the sepulcher, and quickly glancing into the tomb, and finding it empty, he hastens back to inform Peter. In John's mind there may have faintly dawned the perception of the great truth. Peter was determined to make a thorough investigation. Arriving at the sepulcher he enters it deliberately and finds the linen that had been wrapped about the body and head of Christ neatly folded and laid each in a particular place. Perfect order, no confusion was what met his eyes. No sign, no trace here of grave robbers. John beheld the same, and was convinced. Peter, too, must have had his doubts shaken. He returned to the city, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass. Mary Magdalene, who had now arrived fully at the grave, lingered behind sorrowing, when Peter and John left. She beholds the angels seen by her sisters, and whom John and Peter appear not to have beheld. She makes complaint to them of her anxiety when asked for the cause of her sorrow, and before receiving their reply turns and faces Christ, whom she mistakes for the keeper of the place. Then follows that meeting so touchingly told by John. Mary had been the first to see and hold converse with the risen Christ. She goes to bear the tidings of this blessed interview to the disciples. The Lord vanished from Mary's sight, as suddenly as He had appeared, and just as suddenly stands before Mary's companions, the other women, with whom she had started for the tomb, and who were now hurrying back to the city. "All hail!" He greets them; they hear His voice, they recognize His familiar figure, and fall prostrate at His feet. With a greeting to their brethren, whom He now calls His also, and with the direction already communicated by the angels, to meet Him in Galilee, He dismisses them. That was the second manifestation.

Mightily the holy city must have been stirred by the rumors

which seemed to have been blown in upon its inhabitants upon the morning breeze. Consternation reigned among the priests, when the guards had made their report. A hurried meeting is convoked, and the bold plan is decided upon to offer hush-money to the first involuntary witnesses, not of the Lord's resurrection, which no one had seen, but of the amazing circumstances under which the tomb had seemed to open of its own accord. The injunction to the bribed soldiers, to spread the rumor: "His disciples came by night, and stole Him away while we slept," required that the soldiers should incriminate themselves, and that, with an offense which is regarded as an unpardonable offense in military life. For a picket to sleep at his post is considered such a grave dereliction of duty that it has been made punishable by death in all ages. Accordingly, Paley remarks: "It has been rightly, I think, observed, by Dr. Townshend (*Dis. upon the Res.*, p. 126), that the story of the guards carried collusion upon the face of it. Men in their circumstances would not have made such an acknowledgment of their negligence, without previous assurances of protection and impunity." (Works III, 303.)

(To be continued.)

THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF SIN.

A consciousness of moral guilt was the immediate result of the first transgression. Then awoke "the avenging rectoral faculty" in man — Conscience. Even as man has never lost the power of recognizing God in the works of nature (Rom. 1, 19—21), and for this reason is "without excuse" when he transfers his devotions from their true object to idols of his own making, even so the faculty of distinguishing right from wrong, the "sense of sin," and, with it, the consciousness of guilty wrongdoing, has played a leading part in the history of the race and of the individual. It could not be otherwise. "The Gentiles, which have not the Law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the Law *written in their hearts*, their con-

science also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another," Rom. 2, 14. 15. The neglect or misuse of these two powers which man possesses as a natural endowment—a knowledge of the true God and a knowledge of His immutable Law—will constitute the guilt of natural man "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ," v. 16.

In early ages man was not only conscious of this inner law, but was able to trace it back to its origin in the divine mind. In the Zend writings of ancient Persia a "First Law" is explicitly referred to, which was not written, but which the servants of the highest God obtained by immediate and individual revelation "through the ear;" this law, we are told, was later on given a fixed, literary form by Zoroaster.¹⁾ Bluntschli quotes the following from the Brahminic Laws of Mann: "While you are saying 'I am alone,' there dwells in your heart the highest Spirit, an acute and quiet observer of all the good and all the evil that you do." Another Brahminic theologian taught: "The Spirit within, Conscience, has a knowledge of good and evil, and stands in communion with the great World Soul; these two together judge thoughts, words, and actions." The universality of conscience was already recognized by Confucius: "The moral law of the highest philosopher is likewise to be found in the hearts of all men." That the written codes are an outflow of natural law is stated with great clearness by Cicero in the *Offices* (3, 5): "The law of nature is the law of God; human laws, which are established for the benefit of society, do not differ from the law of nature, but are restatements of it (*repetita ex ea*), and in agreement with nature; if they do not so agree, they are unjust and partial." And elsewhere: Laws are not "something constructed by the human mind—but some-

1) Similarly Antigone, in the tragedy, appeals to the higher, "unwritten laws of the gods," in protest against the despotic commands of Creon. (*Antig.*, v. 452.) An ancient code of the Chinese refers to "the Law of the Most High, which is imprinted upon human nature." (Cited by Hofmann, *Das Gewissen*.)

thing eternal, proceeding from the Wisdom which rules the universe with its commands and prohibitions. . . . Ultimate Law is as old as the Divinity; it had its rise *simul cum mente divina*; therefore it can never be abrogated." (*De Legg.* 2, 4. 6.)

Of course, natural man cannot long remain in ignorance of the twofold primary function of conscience. Aristotle²⁾ describes the pleasant sensation which follows right conduct, and the agony of a guilty mind; "the wicked try to flee from themselves, they hate existence and die a self-inflicted death." "Evil conscience is the memory of wicked deeds, good conscience a memory of good deeds," says Seneca. And Cicero refers to the "most pleasurable consciousness of having lived a good life, full of good works." But by far the greater number of passages in which the voice of pagan conscience has found utterance contain reflections on the accusing and convicting power of the inner Voice. The consciousness of moral integrity is exceedingly rare; the *consciousness of guilt*, on the other hand, as universal as paganism itself. A shivering conscience, which "feels the stroke of justice before it falls," has left its record on many a page of ancient literature.

True to the naturalistic tendency of the Hellenic mind, the avenging power of conscience was viewed under the aspect of mythical personification. *Dike* appears in Hesiod and Homer as the goddess of justice, whose seat is by the side of Zeus.³⁾ "If the Sun himself were to go beyond his bounds, the furies of Dike would find him out!" said the "obscure Ephesian."⁴⁾ Both *Nemesis* and *Dike* were termed *ἀδράστεια*, because, says Aristotle, "no one can escape them." *Alastor*—the avenging spirit that roams about, so often referred to in the Attic drama; *Ara*—the curse that follows transgression, from whose temple in Athens those criminals were publicly cursed whom the police authorities could not reach;⁵⁾ *Ate*—a personification of destruction in Homer; and the *Poinai*—or goddesses of punish-

2) In the *Greater Ethics*, cited by Hofmann, op. cit., p. 17.

3) Hesiod, *Op. et Dies*, v. 256.

4) Heraclitus, *Fragm.* 34.

5) Welcker, *Griech. Goetterlehre* III, p. 82.

ment (in Aeschylus) — all these may stand as examples of that intensity with which the Greek expressed the subjective sentiment of Guilt and the related idea of Punishment, as based on simple, concrete fact. Evil Conscience itself was personified in Erinyes; the pangs of an evil conscience, in the Erinyes. They are called *ἡεροφοῖτες*, walking in the dark; *στυγεραί*, terrible; hateful, merciless, stony-hearted, hard-striking (*δασπλήτες*). "Brazen-footed" they are termed by Sophocles,⁶ because they never give up the chase when they once pursue a victim; "even if he fled under the earth — they will surely find him." *Καμπεσίχουνοι* — "bending the knees" of the guilty one, is another epithet quoted by Welcker (op. cit.). They punish even the gods when they have become guilty of wrong (Hesiod in the *Theogony*, v. 220)! "If not my intuitive forebodings are much mistaken," says the chorus in *Elektra*, "the dread avenger Dike is coming apace with punishing power; . . . soon Erinyes appears, fleet-footed and many-handed, *with iron footsteps*, from her awful hidingplace" (v. 473 sqq.).⁷ In the most awful drama of antiquity, the "Erinyes" of Aeschylus, the furies that pursue Orestes into the very temples of the gods do not hesitate to accuse and objugate Apollo himself as instigator and accomplice of Orestes in the murder of his mother. "You, Orestes, must suffer punishment in your turn [in spite of Apollo's intercession], so that I suck from you alive the red gore from your limbs; and having wasted you away I will lead you alive Below, that you may suffer a return for matricidal woe. . . . Fate has destined us to hold this office, to pursue the murderer until he has gone below the earth; and *when dead he is not by any means free!*" (v. 263 sqq.)

The "furies" of Roman mythology are of course copied from the Greek conception of Nemesis and Erinyes. Cicero thus interprets their true character: "The wicked are pursued and terrified by the Furies, not, as represented in the drama, with

6) *Elektra*, v. 491.

7) So, generally, in Greek tragedy, the evil conscience of malefactors finds expression in the sinister warnings and forebodings of the chorus.

burning torches, but with the tortures of Conscience and the agony that follows transgression (*fraudis cruciatus*)."⁸⁾ The very word "*conscientia*" is used to denote "*evil conscience*," "*conscire sibi aliquid*" — to be conscious of wrongdoing. "This shall be thy brazen wall," says Horace, "not to be conscious of any wrong (*nil conscire sibi*), not to grow pale with guilt." (Ep. 1, 1, 60.) "This is the first punishment that lights upon the author of a crime," says Juvenal in the oft-quoted thirteenth Satire, "that by the verdict of his own breast no guilty man is acquitted. . . . *Conscience*, as their tormentor, brandishes a scourge unseen by human hands! Awful, indeed, is their punishment . . . in bearing night and day in one's own breast a witness against one's self. . . . Such is the penalty which the mere wish to sin incurs. For he that meditates within his breast a crime that finds not even vent in words has all the guilt of the *act!*"⁹⁾ . . . These are the men that tremble and grow pale at every lightning-flash; as though not by mere chance, or by the raging violence of the winds, but in wrath and vengeance the fire-bolt lights upon the earth!" "*Nihil est miserius, quam animus hominis conscius*" (of wrong-doing), are the words of old Plautus in the *Mostellaria*; and Quintilian quotes as a common saying: "*Conscientia mille testes*" — an (evil) conscience may stand for a thousand witnesses.

As might be expected, the passages in which the ancients have *ex professo* discussed Natural Law and its relation to conscience, are comparatively few in number, even in the writings of the philosophers and poets. Nor can we from such sporadic instances — however great their value may be to the psy-

8) *De Legibus* 1, 14.

9) "*Facti crimen habet.*" Compare with this the saying of Epictetus: "That which you must not do you must not even wish to do." (*Fragm.* 100.) "Some one asked Thales whether an unjust person remains hidden before the gods; he replied: Not even when he has an evil thought." (Diog. Laertius, *Thales*.) "You may hide before men whatever wrong you commit; before the gods even the thought of it remains no secret." (Lucian, *Epigr.* 8.) This agrees with Aelian's remark (*Var. Hist.* XIV, 28): "In my opinion not only he who commits sin is wicked, but also he who *intends* to do evil."

chologist—obtain an adequate idea of that intense conviction which was the great determining factor in ethnic life and religion—the conviction of *inexpiable moral guilt*. That the human race is totally depraved and fettered in the bonds of sin appears to have been *commune dogma* of the ancients.¹⁰⁾ “It is impossible for man not to be evil,” says Simonides in the dialogue;¹¹⁾ “it is difficult to be virtuous.”¹²⁾ “All men commit more evil deeds than good, from childhood up.”¹³⁾ “More men possess an inclination to do evil than to do good,” says Xenophon in the *Cyropaedia*;¹⁴⁾ and elsewhere: “He is a great fool who does not recognize the evil disposition of the entire human race.”¹⁵⁾ The dramatists expressed the same conviction in unequivocal terms, as when Euripides says: “Sinning comes natural to men,”¹⁶⁾ and in a fragment, “How inborn (ἐμφυτος) is wickedness in all men!”¹⁷⁾ Or Sophocles, in the *Antigone*: “Transgression is universal among men.”¹⁸⁾ Similarly Isocrates: “We are all much more inclined to do evil than to do good.” Among the later authors we may cite Epictetus: “If you desire to become righteous, first admit that you are wicked.” “How, then, is it possible to be sinless? Not by any means (ἀμήχανον)!”¹⁹⁾ And Libanius: “To be sinless is an exclusive prerogative of the gods.” Aelian quotes this apophthegm of Archytas: “To find a person that has not in him something treacherous and malignant, is as difficult as finding a fish without spines.”²⁰⁾ Even Lucian has one of his characters say: “Most men love to tell lies. Some without need much prefer lies to truth, and please themselves and make a business of it without any particular reason. Men have an innate love for lying.”

All antiquity rings with the echo of those words which “the Lord said in His heart: . . . The imagination of man’s

10) A most vivid consciousness of sin, says M. Mueller, *Essays* I, p. 40, “is a prominent feature in the religion of the Veda.”

11) Plato, *Protagoras* 344 C.

13) *Hippius* I, 296 C.

15) *De Bello Pelop.* III, 45.

17) *Bellerophon*, 299.

19) *Diss.* IV, 12, 19.

12) *Ibid.* 339 C.

14) II, 2, 24.

16) *Hipp.* 615.

18) v. 1023.

20) *Variae Hist.* X, 12.

heart is evil from his youth," Gen. 8, 21. They find a close parallel in Cicero's *Tusculanæ Quaest.* (Book III, 2): "Nature gives us very small sparks of virtue; these we soon extinguish entirely as we degenerate through wicked morals and principles, so that the light of nature never again appears. As soon as we see the light of day, we are straightway in every kind of depravity, so that it almost would appear as if we had drawn in error with our mother's milk. . . . Nothing is so wicked that man would not become guilty of it in order to satisfy his lust." "Corrupted by the allurements of lust, we no longer can distinguish those things which are naturally good."²¹⁾ Man's entire helplessness over against temptations cannot be more clearly expressed than in the famous lines of Ovid: "I see the better thing (to do), and approve of it; but I follow that which is evil." "I see what I am now about to do; nor is it ignorance of what is right that leads me astray, but lust."²²⁾ Similarly in the *Amores*: "I hate it; yet I cannot desire *not* to be what I hate!" "We always incline towards forbidden things and desire that which we must not have."²³⁾ Seneca was conscious of "a certain weakness of good intention in all matters."²⁴⁾ He would be satisfied if only every day he could "diminish his vices somewhat and criticise his own faults; ego enim in alto vitiorum omnium sum—for I am on an *Ocean* of every kind of iniquity."²⁵⁾ In another passage Seneca refers to the theory of Berosus, that the world must at some time, by a fatal conjunction of the stars, come to an end in a universal deluge. He does not deny such a possibility, for, he says, "sunt omnia facilia naturae;" but in the end, he thinks, the ancient order of things will be reestablished; "the animal world will be generated anew and a new race of Man, unacquainted with sin (*inseius scelerum*), and born under better auspices, will be given to the earth. But even in their case, innocence will not last long—only while they are still new on the earth. Speedily

21) *De Legg.* I, 47.

22) *Metam.* 7, 20. 92.

23) II, 4, v. 5; III, 4, v. 17. Nitimur in vetitum, etc.

24) *De Tranq. Animi* II.

25) *De Vita Beata*, 17.

wickedness will break forth — virtue will be hard to find. Virtue needs a leader and a guide; vices are learned also without a teacher!"²⁶⁾ The last sentence in this very remarkable passage finds a close parallel in the following, from Hsun Tzu, a Chinese philosopher of the third century B. C.: "By nature, man is evil. If a man is good, *that is an artificial result.*"²⁷⁾

Irving Park, Chicago, Ill.

THEO. GRAEBNER.

(To be concluded.)

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

(Continued.)

Col. 1, 16: *By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible.*

In the Creed we confess: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, *Maker of heaven and earth.*" Luther explains these words thus: "I believe that God has made me and all creatures." By the phrase: *heaven and earth* therefore we mean all creatures, visible and invisible. This truth is beautifully set forth in Col. 1, 16. "By Him were all things (*τὰ πάντα*) created." This is a sweeping assertion. "*All things,*" whether animate or inanimate, rational or irrational, all things that have existence were produced by His creative power. The apostle specifies this comprehensive term *all* by saying: all "that are in heaven, and that are in earth." In whatsoever *place* things may exist, they have been created by Him. A further specification of "all things" is made when the apostle adds: "visible and invisible." Of whatever *nature* the things may be, they are His handiwork. He created the *visible* things, such as the earth with its flora and fauna; the luminaries of heaven: the sun, the moon, the myriads of stars, and, last but not least, man,

26) *Nat. Quaest.* III, 29. 30.

27) Quoted by Giles, *History of Chinese Literature*. Confucius taught: "The most righteous of men cannot conform to the demands of morality in every part; some fault always remains." (Cited by Bluntschli, *Alt-asiatische Gott- und Welt-Ideen.*)

the crown of creation. He called into being the *invisible* things, by which, according to the context, St. Paul primarily understands the heavenly world of spirits—the thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers. In short, God “created heaven, and the things that therein are, and the earth, and the things that therein are, and the sea, and the things that therein are,” Rev. 10, 6. “All things were made by Him; and without Him was not anything made that was made,” John 1, 2.¹⁾

THE GOOD ANGELS.

Hebr. 1, 14: *Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?*

This text gives occasion to speak, 1. of the nature, and 2. of the ministry of the good angels.

1. *Their nature.* They are *spirits*. What is a spirit? This may be clearly seen from the record of that remarkable appearance of the risen Christ, related Luke 24, 36 ff. When the apostles were sitting at supper, with the doors closed through fear of the Jews (John 20, 19), Jesus suddenly appeared in the midst of them, and “they were terrified and affrighted and supposed that they had seen a spirit.” Allaying their fears, the Risen One says: “Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I

1) The context discloses the fact that the phrase “*by Him*” in Col. 1, 16, as well as in John 1, 2, denotes Christ. So Christ is the Creator of the world. And still we confess in the Creed: “I believe in God the *Father* Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth.” How is this to be understood? In the words of Dr. Graebner: “Being an *opus ad extra*, the work of creation was performed with the concurrence of the three Persons of the Godhead. It was the *Father* who made the world *by* the *Son*, Hebr. 1, 1. 2, ‘by whom the world was made,’ John 1, 10, ‘and all things were created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible,’ Col. 1, 16. By the ‘Word of the Lord’ were the heavens made; and all the host of them ‘by the Breath of His mouth,’ Ps. 33, 6, *i. e.*, by the Spirit of God, Gen. 1, 2. But while this work is thus attributed to the three Persons in the Godhead, it is not unscriptural to ascribe it, by appropriation, to the First Person, as is done in the Apostles’ Creed, since in the texts already quoted the world is said to have been made *by* the Son, *by* the Word of the Lord, and *by* the Breath of His mouth, He who by the Son and the Spirit created the world being the *Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth*. Acts 17, 24; coll. v. 31.” (THEOL. QUART., vol. III, p. 5.)

myself: handle me and see; for *a spirit hath not flesh and bones*, as ye see me have." Hence, the angels, being spirits (*πνεύματα*), are incorporeal beings. The supposition that angels possessed a subtile, celestial, material body is refuted by the passage above. Man, consisting of body and soul, is composed of a material and an immaterial element; the angels, however, are simply spirits, without a body or the attributes of material things. Nevertheless they have a personal subsistence; they are *personal* spirits. From our text this truth may be clearly perceived from the fact that they are charged to perform certain tasks—they are *sent forth to minister* unto men. Sadducees, ancient and modern, deny the personal existence of angels; our secular literature, too, is sprinkled with slurs, direct and indirect, at this doctrine; hence the necessity of stressing this truth. Being spirits, the angels are *invisible*. Col. 1, 16 they are enumerated among the *ἀόρατα*, the invisible beings, created by Christ. The fact that angels now and then assumed visible forms does not subvert this doctrine. When they were made, the Mosaic record does not say. That they were called into being within the six days of creation we know. Gen. 1, 1; 2, 2; Ex. 20, 11.

2. *The ministry of the good angels.* Our text informs us in the first place that the ministry of the good angels is *by divine appointment*. They are "*sent forth*." God sends them forth; His messengers they are. What a glorious truth to contemplate! Here is the multitude of the heavenly host, distinguished into various orders by various names, such as principalities, powers, thrones, dominions, etc., standing in the presence of that great and glorious King, whose throne is in the heavens and whose kingdom ruleth over all, ever ready, ever willing to be *sent forth* to execute His every word. Of the "ten thousand times ten thousand" (Rev. 5, 11) of angels not one is, nor would one be, exempt from the duty of serving God. They are "*all ministering spirits*."

The objects of their ministry. They "minister for them who shall be *heirs of salvation*." "*For them*," *διὰ τοὺς*, *on ac-*

count of those, on behalf of those, for the benefit of those, who are the children of God, heirs of God, Rom. 8, 17; 1 Pet. 1, 2.

The *διακονία*, the service, of the angels is intended especially for the pious. It is true, they are not coworkers of our salvation. It has pleased God to use the ministry of sinful men to preach the Gospel of salvation to sinful men. It was something extraordinary when God in the Holy Night and on that eventful Easter day availed Himself of the ministrations of angels to proclaim the tidings of great joy. Still God, whose will is our salvation, sends forth His messengers to keep and protect us, so that the heirs of salvation may reach the appointed goal.

The character of this ministry is indicated by the words "*to minister.*" To minister means *to serve*. Scriptural examples of the service of angels rendered the pious are numerous. Subsequent passages will give occasion to instance a number of them.

For our *consolation* let us bear in mind that this service is being carried on to-day. The Greek word *ἀποστελλόμενα*, *sent forth*, is the present participle, and indicates the act designated by the verb as being permanent. The ministering servants were sent forth in olden times, they are sent forth at the present time, and they ever will be sent forth to the end of time for them who shall be heirs of salvation.

Matt. 25, 31: *When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory.*

When the Son of Man, the once despised Nazarene, returns visibly as the Judge of the world, "coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (Matt. 24, 30), a magnificent retinue — *all the holy angels* — will accompany Him. This sublimely beautiful text does not call for a discussion here, but the phrase "*all the holy angels*" may serve to speak, 1. of the term *angel*, 2. of an attribute of the angels (*holy*), and 3. of the number of angels (*all*).

The Hebrew word for *angel* is מַלְאָךְ (maleach); the Greek is ἄγγελος (angelos). Both words etymologically mean *one who is sent, a messenger*. In the Authorized Version the one word מַלְאָךְ is rendered by two English ones, *angel* and *messenger*; the same is true of the Greek word ἄγγελος. According to a count made, based on Young's Analytical Concordance, the Hebrew term מַלְאָךְ is translated 98 times by the word *messenger*, and 107 times by the word *angel*. The Greek ἄγγελος is rendered but seven times by *messenger* (Matt, 10, 11; Mark 1, 2; Luke 7, 24; 7, 27; 9, 52; 2 Cor., 12, 7; James 2, 25); in all other cases *angel* is the word used. The general principle which the Authorized Version seems to have followed was to translate מַלְאָךְ and ἄγγελος by *messenger*, when the concept indicated by the English word was apparent in the original text, and to restrict the use of the word *angel* as much as possible to the στρατιὰ οὐράνιος, "the heavenly host," Luke 2, 13. From the fact that each of the words, מַלְאָךְ and ἄγγελος, has two renderings, both in English and in German, arises the difference in the translation of some passages of the two versions. Mal. 3, 1: "I will send my *messenger*." "Ich will meinen *Engel* senden." — "The *messenger* of the covenant." "Der *Engel* des Bundes." Mal. 2, 7: "He is a *messenger* of the Lord." "Er ist ein *Engel* des Herrn Zebaoth." Matt. 11, 10: messenger — *Engel*; Luke 7, 24: messenger — Bote; 7, 27: messenger — *Engel*; 9, 54: messenger — Bote; 2 Cor. 12, 7: messenger — *Engel*; James 2, 25: messenger — *Engel*.

Now, as to the application of the word. No less a person than our *Savior Himself* is called "the Angel of the Covenant," Mal. 3, 1; Matt. 11, 10. He is the Angel κατ' ἐξοχήν, the *uncreated* angel, the messenger sent by God to consummate and announce the covenant of grace between God and man. Besides this, which is the highest application of the word "angel," we find it used of any messenger of God. *John the Baptist* was an *angel* of the Lord, Mal. 3, 1; Luke 2, 27; Mark 1, 2, because he was sent by God with a message to prepare the way of the Lord. *Prophets and preachers* are termed *angels* because of

the message they have of God to proclaim to the people. 2 Chron. 36, 15; Hagg. 1, 13; Rev. 2, 1. 8. 12. 18; Mal. 2, 7. In a still wider sense, the words *Maleach* and *angelos* designate *any one bearing a message from one to another*. Gen. 32, 3. 6; Numb. 20, 14; 21, 21; 22, 5; Josh. 6, 17. 25; Judges 6, 35; 7, 24; Luke 7, 24; James 2, 25, etc.

But in its restricted sense, as it is commonly used and commonly understood, the term *angel* denotes a specific creature, the ministering spirit of Hebr. 1, 14. In this use of the word it is also of importance to remember that the term *angel* is an official name, and indicates the purpose for which the heavenly host was destined, *i. e.*, to be "sent forth," Hebr. 1, 14. "The name angel does not describe the nature of the being, but its office, and signifies 'one sent,' a legate, a messenger. Hence Augustine: 'Do you ask for the name of their *nature*? It is spirit. Do you inquire concerning the name of their *office*? It is angel.'" (Quenstedt.) The particular office, for example, which these heavenly messengers are to perform on that great day of which the text speaks is to "gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other," Matt. 24, 31.

These angels are *holy*, says the text, that is, they are without sin. Scripture speaks of holy men and of holy women; all Christians are holy people. The distinction, however, between the holiness of the angels and that of the believers is this: Christians are holy in the sight of God on account of the righteousness and holiness of their Redeemer which they have put on by faith, Gal. 3, 2; the angels, on the other hand, are holy in themselves, having retained their concreated holiness. Being holy, their will is conformable to the holy will of God.

"All the holy angels" will be with Christ at His Second Coming. How glorious a sight that will be for the believers goes beyond the powers of our imagination. But once before, on the Night of the Nativity, when the Word was made flesh, did the entire heavenly host leave its celestial home to fill the still air on the plains of Bethlehem with a melodious symphony,

such as never again was vouchsafed for men to hear; now again, at His final coming, they *all* will be with Him "with a great sound of a trumpet," Matt. 24, 31. There will be assembled the angels and the archangels, the seraphim and the cherubim, the thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers. Is. 6, 2; Gen. 3, 24; Col. 1, 16; 1 Pet. 3, 22; 1 Thess. 4, 16. A glorious host, indeed, and a great host! There is a certain, fixed number of angels. Being sexless, Matt. 22, 30, the number is not multiplied; being immortal, Luke 20, 36, the number is not decreased. How great the number is we do not know; but we do know that it is vast. "A multitude of the heavenly host" sang the first Christmas anthem, Luke 2, 13; the number of them, says Rev. 5, 11, is "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousand of thousands." What a vast assembly! And what a glorious and mighty King must He be who is the Lord of all these hosts!

Matt. 18, 10: *In heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.*

To be admitted to the very presence of an Oriental monarch, to see him face to face, was a distinguished privilege, enjoyed by such only as had gained the special favor and confidence of the king. The queen of Sheba, admiring the wisdom of Solomon, says, "Happy are these thy servants, which are continually before thee." Cf. 2 Kings 25, 19; Jer. 52, 25. How great, then, is the happiness of the angels, these servants of God, who behold the King of kings face to face! To see God face to face, to behold Him as He is, is salvation itself. 1 John 3, 2.

The holy angels are "*in heaven*," where God dwells, hence they are happy, blessed. They "*always* behold the face of my Father which is in heaven," hence *they are always blessed*. This dictum of the Lord excludes the possibility of sinning on the part of the good angels; it teaches their impeccability, and presupposes their confirmation in bliss. In express words their confirmation in bliss is taught Luke 20, 36: "*Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels.*" Quenstedt

says: "Good angels are so confirmed in the good that, as before they were only able not to sin, now they are altogether unable to sin. Matt. 18, 10; 6, 10; 1 Tim. 5, 21; Luke 20, 36; Gal. 1, 8. . . . Those who are to be blessed in eternal life are called 'equal to the angels.' Now, *we* are sure *we* shall never lose that celestial felicity; therefore, much more are the angels thus assured, to whom we shall be like." (Schmid's *Dogmatics* in loco.) When this confirmation took place, Scripture does not say. It suffices us to know the fact. The dogmaticians give it as their opinion that it occurred after the apostasy of the evil angels, as a reward of grace to the good angels for having remained faithful to God.

Observing the context of the present passage we may also note an *employment* of the holy angels. The text is adduced as a motive for not despising the "little ones." "*Their* angels," *i. e.*, the angels of the "little ones," especially appointed to watch and protect them, "do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." To the tender care of such exalted beings Christ's lambs are committed. How great, therefore, is the dignity with which they are clothed, and how heinous is the sin of putting stumbling blocks in their way! How full of consolation, on the other hand, is not this text for the Christian father and mother, who, filled with anxiety for the welfare of their little ones on account of the dangers that also beset them, can calm their troubled hearts with the firm assurance, God's holy angels are with our little ones. Not a hair can fall from their heads without the will of our Father in heaven.

Ps. 103, 20. 21: *Bless the Lord, ye His angels, that excel in strength, that do His commandments, hearkening unto the voice of His word. Bless ye the Lord, all ye His hosts; ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure.*

"*Bless the Lord, ye His angels;*" "*bless ye the Lord, all ye His hosts.*" Thus the choir invisible is called upon to tune their harps in melodious praise of the Lord Jehovah. We know somewhat of the raptures that encompass the soul when hymns

of jubilee go heavenward in one mighty sweep, but all earthly music pales into insignificance when compared with the majestic hymn of praise of the heavenly choristers with which the dome of the Celestial City continually reverberates: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of His glory," Is. 6, 3. The employment of the angels consists in praising God always. And this song service they perform gladly. Their perfect blessedness, consisting in the beatific vision of God, impels them again and again to break out in strains of music, the "leitmotif," the theme, of which is: "Amen: Blessing and glory, and wisdom, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. 7, 11. 12.

When the psalmist says: "*Bless,*" i. e., praise, "*the Lord,*" that is not to be understood "as if they needed any excitement of ours to praise God, they do it continually; but thus he expresses his high thoughts of God as worthy of the adoration of the holy angels; thus he quickens himself and others to the duty, with this consideration, that it is the work of angels." (M. Henry.)

Thus the holy angels praise God continually, and we who have even greater reasons than they to sing the praises of the Lord are so prone to hang our harps upon the willows! *Sursum corda!* "Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless His holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits. Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases." Ps. 103, 1 sqq.

But from adoration the angels may at any time be turned to work. "*They do His commandments,*" they "*do His pleasure.*" (Cf. Hebr. 1, 14.) And there are attendants in plenty to do God's behests, there are "*hosts*" of them; and these *hosts*, these *ministers*, are "*His*," created for His glorification. He, God, is their Lord and Ruler; His every word they cheerfully perform.

Not only are there hosts to do God's word, but they have the ability to carry out every command, they "*excel in strength,*" literally, they are "*mighty in strength,*" heroes in strength. The

angels are created beings, hence they are not omnipotent; God alone is almighty; but their strength is vast. The great slaughter of the firstborn in Egypt, the destruction of the 185,000 of the Assyrian army, each effected by a single angel, are striking proofs of their power.

This great and powerful host is pervaded by but one sentiment—to be willing servants of the Most High. “*They hearken unto the voice of His word.*” They hearken, *i. e.*, they listen intently to catch the first whispered indication of His will. This beautiful imagery indicates the willingness, the eagerness, and the delight with which God’s ministers execute His every word. Contemplating this willing service of the angels, the sigh goes up from the believer’s heart: “Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven!”

Ps. 34, 7: *The angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.*

The Christian’s life is beset with many dangers. His enemies are powerful, Eph. 6, 12. Luther well says: “With might of ours naught can be done, soon were our loss effected.” How consolatory therefore to know that “the angel of the Lord encampeth round about them that fear Him, and delivereth them.” Viewing this encampment with the eyes of faith, we need not fear. The eyes of the Lord are over the righteous. Herod intended to execute Peter. Peter was put in chains and closely watched. Escape seemed impossible. But the Lord sent His angel to deliver him out of the hands of his enemies. Acts 12, 5—10. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego feared the Lord. They would not worship the image of gold set up by Nebuchadnezzar, and hence were cast into a fiery furnace. To his surprise, Nebuchadnezzar saw four men walking in the midst of the fire. The fourth was an angel sent by God to deliver “them that feared Him.” Dan. 3, 6. Daniel feared the Lord. He would not turn idolater at the king’s decree. Though he was cast into the lions’ den, no harm came to him. The Lord sent His angel to shut the lions’ mouth. 2 Kings 6, 17; cf. Gen.

32, 1. Knowing that our path, too, is encompassed with perils manifold, we do well to pray: "Let us this day, and all the remaining time of our mortal life in this vale of tears, be commended to Thy fatherly blessing and divine protection; and may Thy holy angels keep charge over us, that the wicked one may have no power over us."

Ps. 91, 11. 12: *He shall give His angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.*

From the text we observe: 1. that the ministry of the angels is by divine appointment. The text says, "*He,*" God, "shall give His angels charge over thee." This fact we noted in Ps. 103, 20. 21. 2. That they are God's servants, carrying out His behests. They are "*His angels;*" cf. Ps. 103, 20. 21; Hebr. 1, 14. 3. That their ministry is intended especially for the pious. The "*thee*" in the text is he who says of the Lord, "He is my refuge and my fortress: my God, in whom I trust," vv. 2. 9. Cf. Hebr. 1, 14; Ps. 34, 7.

The new matter calling for consideration is the charge committed to the angels, or rather the limitation of the charge: "*To keep thee in all thy ways.*" What does this limitation, "in all thy ways," mean? Whose ways? "*Thy ways,*" that is, the ways of the Christian. What are his ways? Those prescribed by the Word of God. "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to Thy Word," Ps. 119, 9. "Thy Word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path," Ps. 119, 105. Walking on his way through the wilderness of this world, this lamp, this light of the Word, is to show the Christian the path he can safely tread. Protection through the ministry of the angels is promised him only in so far and inasmuch as he walks on this narrow path; in other words, so long as he leads a godly life. A Christian must not argue, "I am a child of God. My Father will now and then overlook my stepping aside out of the beaten, prescribed path." Forsaking the way of the Lord, he becomes un-

godly. Omit the all-important phrase "*in all thy ways*" from the text, and the devil will quote this Scripture for his purpose, to make people enter on foolhardy enterprises. He did it when making his onslaught on Christ in the wilderness. Matt. 4, 1 sqq. The Savior tells him to expect protection where no promise is given is *tempting* God. The high-diver, the "aeronaut," the "loop-the-looper," and others of that ilk, who perform hazardous feats that tend neither to the glory of God nor to the benefit of man, simply tempt God. They have no promise of divine protection. — What a mighty incentive is this passage to take heed to our way according to God's Word! Ps. 119, 19.

The ministry of the angels is furthermore a *continuous* service. It reads, "*In all thy ways.*" Sleeping or waking, at times when there is no apparent danger, or when we are conscious of being in imminent peril, this invisible guard is at our side. We also note the great *carefulness* of their service, which is expressed in the words, "*lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.*" Among the many images these words call to our mind is that of a fond mother carefully watching her toddling child, taking his first lessons in walking. There is a stone in the way. That is a great obstacle for that tot. Harm might come to him. That must not be; her child is in danger. So she carefully lifts him in her arms till the danger spot is passed. Thus God acts towards us. We are His children. He says to the angels: Keep them in all their ways! Help them over difficulties; protect them from danger, and be careful about it. Truly, the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous. He careth for us.

From our past experience can we not recall many an escape from impending danger, on land or on sea, many an unexpected assistance?

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

JOHN WICLIF.

II. THE PATRIOT.

(Continued.)

On February 19, 1377, Wiclif came from Fleet Street by St. Paul's Cross to Ludgate Hill—but he did not come alone. With him came “old John of Gaunt, time-honored Lancaster,” as Shakespeare calls him, the fourth son of Edward III and father of Henry IV, the patron of Geoffrey Chaucer, for thirteen years the practical ruler of England; with him came Lord Henry Percy, later the first Earl of Northumberland and the hero of Chevy Chase, who was the Earl Marshall of England with the sword of state; with him came other powerful supporters, even four Doctors of Divinity, representing the four orders of monks, to help him. The crowd before St. Paul's Cathedral was so dense and excited that an entrance for Wiclif had to be forced. “Dread not the bishops, for they be all unlearned in respect of you,” they cheered Wiclif, as George Frundsberg cheered Luther at Worms. “A tall, thin figure, covered with a long light gown of black color, with a girdle about the body; the head, adorned with a full, flowing beard, exhibiting features keen and sharply cut; the eye clear and penetrating; the lips firmly closed in token of resolution—the whole man wearing an aspect of lofty earnestness, and replete with dignity and character,” such is Lechler's word painting of England's intellectual guide at this time.

William Courtenay, the Bishop of London, on his mother's side a great grandson of Edward I, protested against this assumption of authority within the walls of his own cathedral, and quarreled with the Marshall. When they at last got into Our Lady's Chapel and all were seated, Lord Percy invited Wiclif to sit down also; but the Bishop of London insisted on Wiclif's standing. “Hereupon very contumelious wordes did ryse betwene Syr Henrye Percy and the bishoppe, and the whoole multitude began to be troubled.” John of Gaunt threatened to drag the bishop out of the church by the hair of his

head, and the court broke up in confusion; no sentence was passed, and no official record of the proceedings was kept.

Foiled in this attempt, the help of the Pope was sought: fifty of Wiclif's opinions were sent to Avignon, and their condemnation was asked for.

On the advice of the holy nuns Catherine of Siena and the Swedish St. Bridget, but against the earnest wish of his cardinals, Gregory XI ended the seventy years' Babylonish captivity of the popes at Avignon in France, and sailed from Marseilles to Civita Vecchia, and on January 17, 1377, solemnly entered Rome amid great popular rejoicing, and on May 22, in the splendid Cathedral of San Maria Maggiore, issued five bulls, one to the King, one to the University of Oxford, and three to the Archbishop and Bishop of London, demanding the trial and imprisonment of Wiclif.

Edward III died on June 21, and the son of his gallant Black Prince became King Richard II—eleven years old.

Spite of the Pope's bulls, Parliament at Gloucester, in October, formally consulted Wiclif in the grave matter, whether it might lawfully keep English money from going out to absentee holders of English church offices. Wiclif in his "Responsio" boldly argued that Parliament had the legal right to do so; he even spoke of the "asinine folly" of paying Peter's pence. His friends protested against his imprisonment "at the command of the Pope, lest they should seem to give the Pope dominion and royal power in England," and the Vice-chancellor of Oxford had to content himself with requiring Wiclif to remain in the Black Hall. Even for this he was later driven from office by the King. Sturdy John of Northampton boasted that no bull of the Pope should harm John Wiclif in the limits of London. Sergeant holds him "the most important religious factor in England" at that time.

Even the theologians were in favor of Wiclif; the Chancellor and doctors all affirmed his conclusions to be true, "although they were ill-sounding propositions."

When, at last, Wiclif appeared before the two prelates in

the Archbishop's chapel at Lambeth, March, 1378, to answer to the nineteen condemned conclusions, Princess Joan, widow of the Black Prince and mother of the young King Richard II, sent Sir John Clifford, forbidding the prelates to interfere with Wiclif, and the citizens of London burst into the chapel and broke up the trial, so that it came to nothing, as the first had done. Wiclif was upheld by his prince and by his people, as was Luther later in Saxony.

It seems Wiclif's trial at Lambeth passed off without any formal sentence, though he was more or less formally requested not to teach these doctrines in the schools or the pulpit "on account of the scandals [against the clergy] which they excited among the laity." Apparently he paid not the slightest attention to these precepts of the prelates; on the contrary, he used his triumph to publish his great "*Summa in Theologia*" in thirty-three articles, in twelve books, both in Latin and in English. A part of this work is the "*De Ecclesia*," edited by Loserth, and Hus' "*De Ecclesia*" is but a meager abridgment of Wiclif's work. If the work of Hus produced such a powerful impression on the men of his day, what would the work of Wiclif have done?

In 1520 Luther at Wittenberg printed Hus' "*De Ecclesia*," and, in 1521, the Bohemian Utraquists presented Luther with a copy of Hus' "*De Ecclesia*." Buddensieg says that the ideas of Hus, and of course of Wiclif, can be traced through long portions of Luther's "*Papsttum zu Rom*;" the same holds good, though in less degree, of Luther's "*An den christlichen Adel*" and "*Von der Babylonischen Gefangenschaft*." He also says that the Wiclif Codex No. 1387 in Vienna bears the name Doctor Martinus Luter in a hand of the sixteenth century. Wiclif's "*De Christo et Adversario suo*" seems to have suggested Hus' "*De Anatomia Christi*," which again seems to have suggested Luther's and Cranach's "*Passionā Christi und Anti-christi*" of 1527.

There was very little in Wiclif's "conclusions" which could not boast a very respectable churchly authority: as yet

no point of doctrine was attacked; so far only principles of church property and practice were touched. What was new was that here for the first time a bold and revered university professor called on the State to reform a corrupt and unwilling Church.

In the Parliament of October, 1378, the bishops petitioned against Lancaster's killing of two squires and a cleric in violently resisting legal arrest, and Wiclif's tongue and pen were used to defend the layman against the clerics, and the reply of the Lords to the Bishops is most likely the language of Wiclif and really the sum of a part of his work on the Church, "De Ecclesia."

III. THE THEOLOGIAN.

On March 27, 1378, fourteen months after his festive entry into Rome, Gregory XI died. Twelve days after Bartholomaeus of Prignano, Archbishop of Bari, became Pope Urban VI. In the middle of May the French cardinals withdrew to Anagni, and at the end of July sent a letter to the Pope asking him to resign, saying his election was illegal, owing to the violence of the Roman mobs. On September 20, at Fondi, in Neapolitan territory, they elected Cardinal Bishop Robert of Cambray, Count of Geneva, known as Clement VII, and the great scandalous schism of thirty years was begun. At first Wiclif thought well of Urban VI and trusted he would at last begin the sorely needed reform of the Church, but when the two rival popes hurled the most terrible curses at one another and drove the nations of Europe to take sides and embroiled them in bloody wars, they appeared to Wiclif as "false popes," "whose office was without warrant in the Bible," apostates, members of Antichrist and not of Christ, "the two halves of Antichrist," "praise God, who split the head of the serpent, let the two parts destroy each other." He renounces the pope and denounces him as Antichrist, "the head vicar of the fiend," "glowing with satanic pride and simoniacal greed," "a sinful idiot who might be a damned devil in hell."

In order to get the sinews of war for his crusade against

his French rival pope, Urban VI sold indulgences in England. One of the hucksters said at his command angels came from heaven to free souls in purgatory and lead them straight to heaven if the people paid well into the war chest of this holy crusade. Evidently Tetzels later took a leaf out of this man's book. Henry Spencer, the bloody bishop of Norwich, who had cruelly butchered peasants in 1381, in person led an army of ruffians to Flanders against "the Clementines," the followers of Clement VII. Here was a grand exhibition of every papal abuse Wiclif had complained of, and in 1382 he for the last time used his pen for political pamphlets. In the "Cruciata," his most powerful polemic, Wiclif denounces the crusade and calls the indulgences the "abomination of desolation in the holy place," and says "the pope has left the path of Christ and is walking in the path of Satan," and that this is the cause of the misery of the Church.

As Wiclif studied the Bible, he began to see that the corruption of the Roman church came from the false doctrine of the Roman church, and he began the great appeal to the Bible. His summons to the State to reform the Church gave the first distinct keynote which the great reforming Councils of Basle and Constance took up in the next century.

The more he studies the Bible, the clearer becomes his judgments, the firmer his language: "In a single word of the Bible there is more wholesome teaching than in all the decretals and bulls" of the pope; "if you do not know the Bible, you will become the slave of the Antichrist;" "not to know the Bible is not to know Christ, to be contrary to the Bible is to be a heretic;" "the Bible alone is infallible, true in all its parts, the only authority for the faith of the Church;" "a book for everybody;" "if we had a hundred popes and all the friars of the world were turned into cardinals, yet should we more trust the Gospel than all this multitude."—To tradition he gave a lower place, the consensus of Christendom deserved respect, but the decrees of councils were of no authority if against the Bible. He did not reject reason, but held that it

alone could not discover truth. The light of nature had its place, and he would accept its helpful offices, but the Bible is the last and infallible basis of belief and supreme judge of doctrine and practice. And this Bible every Christian must interpret for himself. "Christ hath made His servants free, but Antichrist hath made them bond again." "To say that laymen are not entitled to sit in judgment upon the life and official conduct of their spiritual superiors, is as much as to say that it is not competent for the laity to concern themselves about their own salvation." Everyone able to read has the right to get his religion direct from the Bible.

In addition to translating the Bible, Wiclif wrote his great Bible apology, "On the Truth of the Holy Scripture," to the editing of which Prof. Buddensieg gave twenty years of his life. In it he says: "No Christian dare admit the Bible teaches anything wrong. He that has a false understanding of the Bible dare not admit error to be in the Bible, for the error is not in the Bible, but in him that explains it erroneously. God's Word is the basis for every article of faith, the example and mirror in which the Christian may detect every error. The Holy Scripture is the faith of the Church, and the clearer we know its true meaning, the better. Spite all hindrances the French have translated the Bible from Latin into French, why not the English? And if English lords have French Bibles, it is not unreasonable to have them in English also." "Christen men and women, olde and young, shulden study fast in the New Testament, and no simple man of wit shulde be aferde unmeasurably to study in the text of Holy Writ. Pride and covetise of clerks is cause of their blyndnesse and heresie, and priveth them fro verie understanding of Holy Writ. The New Testament is of ful autoritie, and open to understanding of simple men, as to the poynts that ben most needful to salvation. The texte of Holy Writ ben wordes of everlasting life, and he that kepeth mekeness and charitie hath the trewe understandyng and perfection of all Holy Writ. It seemeth open heresy to say that the Gospel with his truth and freedom suf-

fisheth not to salvation of Christen men without kepyng of ceremonies and statutes of sinful men and unkunninge, that ben made in the tyme of Sathanas and Antichriste."

The Church is the communion of saints, the whole number of those that shall be saved, the mystical body of Christ; the Pope cannot be head of this Church, that is Christ only; it is impossible to excommunicate anyone from this church unless he have first done it himself.

By ordinance of Christ priests and bishops are all one, and all pastors are of equal grade, and all Christians are spiritual priests; Church and State are to be separate; the seat of all power and authority, in Church and State, is in the people.

The two sacraments of Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper are not empty signs, but real means of grace, even if the priest is an unworthy man, though faith is needed to get the benefit; he hinted very strongly that the other five were no more sacraments than preaching.

Any slight good work done the living is far better than any amount of treasure for the soul of a dead man. The treasury of the merits of the saints in heaven from which the Pope sells indulgences is a swindle to cheat Christians and pick their pockets, and the people who let themselves be cheated are fools.

The worship of saints and images he rejected; saints he honored, and images he tolerated. For confirmation and extreme unction he finds no warrant in the Bible. Private confession is good in itself; public confession is better; enforced auricular confession is a "sacrament of the devil," an invention introduced after Satan had been loosed, and confessors are "idolatrous, leprous, and simoniacal heretics." Enforced celibacy is unscriptural and immoral. Indulgences are "blasphemy, lewdest heresy." He was earnestly opposed to all wars, and would have made a good member of a Peace Congress at The Hague. Relics, pilgrimages, purgatory, papal bulls, priestly absolution he rejected. The hierarchy of Rome are "the twelve daughters of the diabolical leech;" the cardinals are "incarnate devils;" the monks "gluttonous idolaters."

In earlier years Wiclif had thought well of the begging monks over against the wealthy secular clergy, but in time he saw their corruption, and about 1378 he began his vigorous assaults on them as the supports of the Pope. When it was said the Bible does not know monks, Wiclif with mild sarcasm answered: "But it does; in this text: 'I know you not.'" He bitterly assailed them for their share in carrying on this war, for their indulgences and sale of prayers, for their cupidity, luxury, extravagance, and fight against the English Bible. William of Wykeham, the political opponent of Wiclif, the founder of New College, declared with grief, that upon "a diligent examination of the various rules of the religious orders and comparison with the lives of their several professors, he could not anywhere find that the ordinances of their founders, according to their true design and intention, were at present observed by any of them."

Twenty years before Wiclif began his protest against the flagrant abuses in the Church, Bishop Fitz Ralph of Armagh laid his famous indictment of the four orders of the monks before the Pope at Avignon. He said, "I have in my diocese of Armagh two thousand persons a year (as I think) who are excommunicated for willful homicide, public robbery, arson, and similar acts; of whom scarcely forty in a year come to me or my parish priests for confession. For commonly, if there be any cursed swearer, extortioner, or adulterer, he will not be shriven at his own curate, but go to a flattering friar, that will assail him falsely for a little money by year." The rich were forgiven for a window in the cloister, the poor for a pair of shoes or a dinner. Some of the monks even gave it out that any man or woman who put on a friar's dress at the hour of death could not be damned.

Owing to the scarcity of clergymen after the plague, Archbishop Islip ordained laymen, and he "did ordain that more should not be given to priests for their yearly stipend than three pounds six shillings and eight pence, which caused many of them to steal," Stow naively tells us.

In 1379 Wiclif was very ill, but when four monks came to convert him, he called his servant to prop him up in bed and said, "I shall not die, but live, and declare the works of the friars."

As early as 1362 Wiclif had doubts about Transubstantiation, and in 1367 he taught the "sacramental presence" of Christ's body. In the spring of 1381 he put forth his powerful Twelve Theses on the Eucharist, in which he denies that the bread is destroyed after consecration; it does not cease to be bread, though Christ's body is present, really, not locally, but sacramentally, as really as the bread, in "a sacramental coexistence," "as Christ is at once God and man, so the Sacrament is at once Christ's body and bread, bread in a natural manner, Christ's body in a sacramental manner." He insists that Transubstantiation was neither taught in the Word of God nor supported by tradition in the first thousand years of the Church, and calls it the most dangerous heresy ever smuggled into the Church by cunning hypocrites; it denies the truth of Scripture, robs the people, is a cause of idolatry, the people making the wafer their God, the priest having "made the body of Christ." Lord Brougham, Dr. Storrs, and the Encyclopedia Americana say Wiclif taught practically and substantially the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and Lechler says he was nearer to Luther than to Zwingli and Calvin. "Wiclif's doctrine is an echo of the Apostles and a prelude to the Reformation." — "From the eleventh century the dogma of the Church has been perverted. The popes have been wrong, the councils have been wrong, the decretals are full of heresy. If Rome will not unsay her false doctrine, the national churches must repudiate her claim to lead them. She has built up a crazy superstructure on the true foundation; we must sweep it away, and get back to the life and words of Christ." "We have but to preach constantly the Law of Christ, even before the prelates of Caesar, and a blooming martyrdom will promptly come, if we abide in faith and patience." (*Dialogus* III, ch. 15.)

This attack on the very foundation of the papacy created a sensation and consternation, as did the famous theses of Luther in 1517. Lancaster and other powerful friends told him they could not follow him in his heresy. But Wiclif was nothing daunted. Sure of the truth of his position, he deliberately sacrificed the protection of the court. If need be, he could die for the truth, but he would not deny the truth.

Still more friends were estranged from Wiclif's cause by the rising of the peasants in this same year.

The awful plague of the "Black Death," in 1349, cut down the population of England one half, London alone losing 100,000. Many left their property to the Church, so that she owned one third of the soil of England, and her dues amounted to twice the royal revenue. The wars with France were a heavy drain on the country, and the burden of taxation fell heaviest on the peasants, the Church being untaxed.

In 1379 a poll tax was levied, unheard of till then; it was paid "with great grudging and many a bitter curse," Hollinshed chronicles. In 1381 it was ruthlessly collected, and under the "mad priest" John Ball, Jack Straw, and Wat Tyler the peasants revolted, as they had done in France in the Jacquerie for the same reason. They were willing to pay the fifteenth, as their fathers had done, but they could not possibly pay this tax.

The peasants rose against their oppressors in Essex, Kent, Suffolk, and elsewhere; they marched on London and sacked the city, they burned Gaunt's palace in the Savoy, on June 13, 1381, they in the Tower beheaded Archbishop Sudbury, the responsible Chancellor since July 4, 1379. The young King rode out and made them satisfactory promises. The promises were not kept. As in the Peasants' War in Luther's time, the peasants were forcibly put down and cruelly slaughtered, seven thousand were burned, beheaded, disemboweled. This went on till January, 1382, when the fifteen year old King Richard II married Anna of Luxemburg, sister of King Wenzel of Bohemia and daughter of the German Emperor Charles IV. It is worthy

of mention that she brought with her a Bible in Latin, German, and Bohemian.

Though Wiclif was not responsible for the rising of the peasants, still Wiclif's enemies heaped the blame on him and on his teaching, and with the timid and prudent Wiclif's cause was much damaged, as was Luther's cause in his day.

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

(To be continued.)

IN BEHALF OF PAUL GERHARDT AND THE ELENCHUS.

Six weeks before his sixtieth birthday, at an age when the judgment of men is matured and their actions are taken deliberately, Paul Gerhardt, poet-confessor of the Lutheran Church, resigned his office of second *Diakonus* at St. Nicolai in Berlin (January 27, 1667). The reasons for this painful step appear to pass the comprehension of not a few of his less scrupulous epigones in the land over which the resolute house of Hohenzollern holds sway. Palmer confesses that he is "puzzled" at Gerhardt's action. He is at a loss to understand "why a poet of so rich and pure a mind, and a theologian whose religion and Christianity was not riveted to dogmatic formulas,—as has been the case with many before and after him,—not only failed to keep aloof from the wrangles of his day, but is even seen to have been the most uncompromising opponent of the Reformed theologians." He has scanned critically the features of Gerhardt in the portraits which Langbecker and Schulz have added to their biographies of Gerhardt, and he declares: There is not a trace of bigotry, of the *odium theologicum*, discernible in this benevolent countenance; it reminds one much more of Herrnhut than of Wittenberg portraits. He concludes, accordingly, that in Gerhardt's resignation "we have before us a psychological problem to which our modern theological consciousness furnishes no key, because we

have been taught to view the ethical content of Christianity in a relation of greater freedom not to faith but to fixed dogmatical formulas, and, in particular, not to regard the pulpit as the arena for theological controversy. What was demanded of Gerhardts appears to us as so self-manifest that we would not view those demands as a limitation placed upon academic liberty, all the more because the end of preaching and ecclesiastical decorum of themselves erect necessary barriers to the freedom of speech. Nor could Gerhardts desire for his own person that license which zealots demanded; the Electoral edicts must have seemed oppressive least of all to him." He grants, however, that it must have been the conscience in Gerhardts that caused him to tremble at the mere possibility of making even a slight advance to Reformed theology. And the warning to his son in Gerhardts's testament: "Beware of syncretists; for they seek temporal gain and keep faith neither with God nor man," Palmer views as evidence that the pious mind of Gerhardts, reared as it was in the Lutheran faith, felt the disturbances which Reformed and unionistic tendencies had created at Berlin as a profanation of sentiments which he regarded as sacred. He believes that the age of Gerhardts was still at a far remove from the unqualified postulate of modern enlightenment, viz., that opponents in a controversy must endeavor to comprehend each other's views, each trying to place himself in the other's position, — an art which Palmer thinks does not by any means lead to indifferentism or to the surrender of the basic principles of a person's faith, but rather to clemency and justice in framing one's judgment of another's views. (Herzog, R. E. 5, 47 f.) Twisten criticises Gerhardts's action from the view-point of the unionist. He argues that a certain minimum of union must be allowed in every case where two or more churches meet within the same territory. Such ethical relations as connect a person with the commonwealth and the family, being common to members of all churches, must remain points of contact and occasions for fellowship between them, and each church must reduce the demands which it makes upon its mem-

bers for exclusiveness to such a degree as to render such fellowship possible. An absolute separation between members of dissenting churches would not only prohibit intermarriage between them and thus destroy the wholesome influence of kinship and domestic relations, but it would even render the peaceful coexistence of such church-members within the same community, their neighborly intercourse, their cooperation in secular pursuits, their joint action as a body politic impossible. Accordingly, Twesten holds that the law of parity pursuant to the convention of the Peace of Westphalia has made it incumbent upon states to constantly guard against excesses of one denomination against the other and to confine each within the limits of its covenanted concessions. Nor should such guardianship of the state be resented by the churches as coercion, because 1) that which the state aims at is a duty which the Church owes to mankind regardless of any state action, viz., to cultivate Christian kindness, peaceableness, concord, and to exercise a Christian influence within the commonwealth; 2) because the state holds this relation of guardian towards all churches alike. A condition of mutual forbearance and toleration will thus ensue, and all churches will, under the practical working of this law, aid in exhibiting Christianity as a factor in the forming and conserving of the civic order and of society in general. He concludes: "While in the seventeenth century even so mild-mannered a gentleman as the poet Paul Gerhardt resigned his office rather than consent to the supposition that he would refrain from condemning and scoffing at the confession of his prince, even when not expressly obligated to that effect, there will be hardly any one found in Prussia nowadays for whom the Electoral edicts of 1661 and 1662 would require to be renewed." (Herzog, R. E. 16, 676 f.) Krummacher charges Gerhardt and his associates with evading the point at issue in the controversy with the Reformed theologians, because the former refused to regard the latter as brethren by stating: "A Christian is a person who holds the true saving faith pure and unadulterated, and also exhibits the fruits thereof in his

life and conversation; hence, I cannot regard the Calvinists *qua tales* as Christians." (Pieper, *Zeug. d. Wahrh.* 4, 446.) Henke plainly shows disdain of the Lutherans in the controversy with the Great Elector because "they scrupled about abandoning their attacks upon, and their condemnation of, those doctrines which had been rejected in the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, and seemed to fear that they were violating their oath of allegiance to those writings." (Herzog, R. E. 15, 360.) Victor Strauss censures both parties to the controversy for their failure to take a philosophical view of the difficulties existing between them. "Granted," he says, "that the Elector was actuated by the best motives, still his whole effort was a mistake. The unity of the spirit can be attained only by an historical process by which contrasts are resolved into that higher truth in which they are one. This truth, however, cannot be discovered by a royal mandate; the Spirit of God, who will have no one to prescribe time or place to Him, must reveal it. It has been said that the government must be above the parties. That is fair whenever the point at issue is the rights and duties of the parties within the state. But this demand cannot be fulfilled in the domain of truth and the perception of truth, especially religious truth. As regards this domain, the government as such must take its position altogether outside of the party lines; any interference on its part is either superfluous, or fruitless, or unjust. The history of the spirit cannot be made [to order]. However, this is rarely understood. Any one who is serious in his convictions naturally believes himself to be right, and regards the opposition with which he meets as springing from sources of insincerity, stubbornness, passion. So the Elector regarded the conduct of the Lutheran preachers, and so the Lutherans and the Reformed regarded each other's conduct." (*Sonntagsbibl.* 1, 70.)

Some things in the views expressed sound strange to an American. Twesten's argument, *e. g.*, seems beside the mark to one who has grown up and lived in a commonwealth where church and state are separated, and the state regards the mem-

bers of the church merely as citizens on a parity with other citizens, where governmental action looking toward the regulation of the internal affairs of the Church, or the relation of one denomination to another, is not so much as thought of, and where the denominations recognize that their members have duties to perform to the commonwealth and to one another as neighbors and fellow citizens. We understand from Twesten that matters are different in countries, like Prussia, where the state is a determining factor in the arranging of the affairs of the Church. But Twesten commits an historical inaccuracy when he refers to Gerhardt's resignation in the connection he does. For the inference can be none other than that Gerhardt's position and that of the Lutheran clergy affected the civic and social relations of church-members. This is not true. Gerhardt, in particular, was very popular in Berlin, as a kind-hearted pastor, of cordial address. Neither against him, nor against the other Lutheran pastors was there a charge of unneighborliness or insubordination to the magistrates raised. On the contrary, the city council of Berlin and the Estates of Brandenburg, yea, and the various guilds of Berlin, irrespective of creed, united in invoking the Electoral clemency in his behalf when his resignation had become known. Gerhardt's letters to the Elector (see Becker, *Paul Gerh.*, p. 52) breathe loyalty and reverence for the prince. So do the statements which Gerhardt's superior, Lilius, had to make to the Elector. And all the counsels which the Lutheran clergy in Berlin, Stendal, etc. received in those days from Jena, Leipzig, Wittenberg, Nuremberg, Stralsund, Hamburg, Greifswald, Rostock (see Loescher, *Alt. u. Neu.*) do not contain a single hint, that the civil relations of the Lutherans to their sovereign and to their fellow citizens had become an issue. At the conclusion of the Berlin Colloquy the Lutheran theologians declared, 1) that they would abide by the doctrines of their Church; 2) that they would show to the Reformed all neighborly and Christian love, and would wish from their heart that they (the Reformed) would all be saved. (Becker, p. 31.) The Electoral edicts, it is true,

mention heated debates in towns and villages between adherents of dissentient creeds, and manifest concern for the maintenance of the public peace. But these disturbances cannot have been either so numerous or so violent as to call for the drastic measure of "muzzling the pulpit." Besides, a prince who desired Heidegger's *Diatribē* circulated (Herzog, 5, 656) can hardly be taken seriously when he declares his sensitiveness with regard to such a designation as Calvinist.

Palmer, too, misstates the scope of the Electoral edict. The edict seems to treat both the Lutheran and the Reformed Church alike, but there is an unmistakable effort made to bring the Lutherans over to the *Confessio Marchica*. The Elector cites the example of his predecessors, especially John Sigismund, who first introduced the Reformed Church in the Mark, and declares that he purposes to continue their work. The edict of 1614 was therefore reiterated in 1662. Moreover, the Elector minimizes the doctrinal differences between Lutheranism and Calvinism. "Unsere in etliche puncten dissidenten Evangelischen Unterthanen," he styles his subjects. He pleads for "mutua tolerantia und vertraeglichkeit;" he desires to make "einen guten Anfang zum Evangelischen Kirchen-Frieden." Lastly, he takes a very decided stand in favor of those theologians in the Lutheran and in the Reformed Church "who have published irenic writings, and have proved that the *dissensus* among the Evangelical parties is not fundamental, and that a *tolerantia Ecclesiastica* might well be established." Accordingly, he will not permit these theologians to be called hypocrites, Calixtinians, and Syncretists. (See Loescher, *Alt. u. Neu.* 1736, p. 51—58.) What the Elector wanted was what the Hohenzollern dynasty has always wanted, and what it has succeeded in establishing in Prussia in 1820,—a state-church with more or less distinct Reformed coloring. Palmer also emphasizes that the Elector declared that he was not opposed to the proper use of the elenchus, nor did he wish to curtail the religious liberty of his subjects. True, this statement was made about the time when Gerhardt took his departure from

Berlin, at a time of great popular unrest. It was a diplomatic assurance,—oil upon the troubled waters. Contemporaneous events, however, seemed to justify the fears of the people. Rektor Rango makes complaint that a Lutheran preacher was haled before the magistrates because he had used the expression “the blood of God” (Acts 20, 28) in one of his sermons. The preacher had not referred to the Reformed doctrine at all, but this expression was regarded as in itself an attack upon Calvinism. Pastor Helwig reports to Dr. Titius at Helmstaedt that the sale of Lutheran literature is connected with some danger in Berlin, and that the booksellers are afraid to display Lutheran brochures, but Reformed writings are exhibited and sold without danger. With these *facts* before them, what value could to the Lutheran pastor attach to the Elector’s *words*? Besides, the very terms of the Elector’s assurance were indefinite, vague: he declared that he was not opposed to the “noetige tractirung der Controversien und des Elenchi.” Under the very terms of this assurance the Elector was free at all time to proceed against any preacher whose “tractirung” he regarded as not “noetig.”

These facts must be borne in mind, in order to enable us to understand Gerhardt’s action. The Lutherans in the Mark would simply have been blind if they had not interpreted the Electoral tendency as hostile to their church. They were not to renounce their faith, they were not to be coerced into adopting the Elector’s creed; they were to be tolerated, as long as they kept very quiet, and signed a formal statement to that effect. On the other hand, any one who inclined to adopt the Reformed faith was distinctly favored, and his example was commendably mentioned in high places. When the Elector informed the Berlin city council that he would not require Gerhardt to sign the statement, it seemed that Gerhardt had gained his point, and was free to continue his work as a Lutheran theologian without any restrictions. However, the messenger of the Elector who informed Gerhardt of the Elector’s action concluded his message by adding, that the Elector was

satisfied that Gerhardt would carry out the injunctions contained in the Edict, although he had not signed a statement to that effect. Gerhardt was not even asked to return a verbal reply to this statement. His silence would have been construed as consent. This proposal must have been revolting to a conscientious mind. There was but one course open to him, and that he took. He resigned, and any one else with a conscience must do the same under like circumstances.

But was it necessary, indeed, that Lutherans should oppose the doctrine of the Reformed church? Have they not overestimated the necessity of the elenchus? What does Scripture say with regard to the elenchus?

Paul enumerates, in 2 Tim. 3, 16, four uses of Scripture. They may be viewed as two pairs, arranged in the order of chiasmus, thus: doctrine and reproof, the first pair, represent the instructive qualities of Scripture, the former from the positive, the latter from the negative side. Scripture furnishes the Christian teacher both the thesis and the antithesis. Correction and instruction in righteousness, the second pair, represent the educative qualities of Scripture, the former from the negative, the latter from the positive side. Scripture furnishes the Christian teacher the antidote for ungodliness and the stimulant for godliness. Doctrine and life, faith and practice, the premises and the conclusions of Christianity, are drawn from Scripture, which have been made "able" (v. 15) and "profitable" (v. 16) for these very ends. As to the doctrine and faith, Scripture states both what is truth and what is error; as to life and practice, Scripture states both what is vice and what is virtue. Thus constituted Scripture is the adequate means for the accomplishment of the work of "the man of God" (v. 17), *i. e.*, the Christian teacher, the pastor, the theologian. (Comp. 1 Tim. 6, 11.) The latter is "thoroughly furnished" for his entire work only when he employs Scripture in this fourfold manner.

As regards the theologian in his capacity of teacher of the divine Word, it is plain that the apostle desires him to act both

as instructor (πρὸς διδασκαλίαν) and as censor (πρὸς ἐλεγχον). These are distinct functions. Διδασκαλία is not ἐλεγχος, and vice versa. It is true, indeed, that the mere statement of a truth *implies* and even *necessitates* the rejection of the contrary error. But the statement of the truth is not in itself and in due form that rejection. It is also true that opposition to an error presupposes the previous acceptance of the contrary truth. The mere lust of strife is never a justifiable propelling cause to a theological controversy: the Christian polemist must not so much have something to fight against as rather something to fight for. The separate mention, therefore, of doctrine and reproof as standing *usus Scripturae* amounts to the service of notice upon the theologian that he must, indeed, do the former, but not leave the latter undone; that his function as teacher of men embraces both *Lehren* and *Wehren*; he must wield the trowel and the sword, or to borrow the beautiful imagery of Luther, the theologian must be both shepherd and watchdog: he must pasture his flock and resist the raiding wolf. Dumb dogs that cannot bark are declared unfit for the office of watchmen in the Church of God. (Is. 56, 10.)

The only pertinent question in this connection can be as to the mode of the reproof, the proper occasions for it, and the extent to which it should be applied. Ἐλεγχος denotes a convincing argument, a proof. The Septuagint renders Job 23, 4: τὸ στόμα μου ἐμπλήσει ἐλέγχων, "I would fill my mouth with arguments." The impatient sufferer longs to take his cause before the judgment seat of Jehovah and argue his innocence to God. He would also refute and censure the charges and insinuations of his mistaken friends, Job 6, 26; 13, 6; 16, 21. Ἐλεγχος, then, is that which shows truth to be truth, and error, falsehood, evil to be such; it is that which hushes the gainsayer. The verb ἐλέγχειν is used, in classical Greek, to denote an investigation with hostile intent, and hence, the conviction of an opponent. (See Cremer, *Woerterb.*, and Stephanus, *The-saurus*, sub voce.) It has retained this meaning in the New

Testament: ἐλέγχειν denotes convincing a person of error or wrongdoing and reprehending him for it. Witness the following: James 2, 9: "If ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors," ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὡς παραβάται. In the instance here assumed the elenchus embraces the statement of a distinct fault, the charging of that fault to a distinct person, and the branding of that person with a name that is to carry just reproach. These features of the elenchus appear likewise in Matt. 18, 15 f: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and ἐλεξον αὐτόν," etc. Our Authorized Version has rendered this phrase excellently: "Tell him his fault," thus making both the deed and the doer the objective of the elenchus. This elenchus is not a deduction which someone makes from another's statement, not the personal application of a general censure, not an inference, not a vague hint, but a direct charge. The whole context, moreover, shows that the elenchus is a very personal and earnest procedure. It begins with a private tete-a-tete; but the censor, conscious of the justice of his cause, arraigns the trespasser also before witnesses, giving his reasons and meeting the counter-reasons of his opponent, and finally carries his complaint before the spiritual supreme court for final adjudication. The aim of the elenchus is to gain the brother. This implies that the brother is in danger of being lost, *i. e.*, that he is in a damnable state, that he is on the point of sacrificing his salvation. Hence the result, when the elenchic effort miscarries: "Let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican," v. 17, *i. e.*, brand him and treat him henceforth as an infidel and a profligate. This extremely reproachful verdict is still a part of the elenchus, which began at the personal encounter. Such a verdict whenever uttered carries on its face the declaration that the parties rendering it regard the person against whom it is rendered as one who sins against better knowledge, who has stifled his own conscience, and has placed himself outside of the pale of the Christian brotherhood. In 1 Tim. 5, 20 we find mentioned as the objective of the elenchus "them

that sin," and in Eph. 5, 11. 13 "the unfruitful works of darkness," hence, particular men and particular actions. But the latter text indicates a more indirect form of the elenchus. In v. 11, indeed, the apostle demands a personal separation of consistent Christians from certain other persons, but in v. 13 he ascribes elenchic force to the common preaching of God's Word, when he says: "All things that are reprov'd are made manifest by the light." It is to the same point when the Lord, in John 3, 20, says: "Every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd," and when Paul writes in 1 Cor. 14, 24: "If all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all" (*ἐλέγχεται ὑπὸ πάντων, ἀνακρίνεται ὑπὸ πάντων*). Error and vice love darkness, and those that are addicted to them shun an open and honest contest with truth and virtue. Meanwhile the preaching of God's Word goes on, and the light streams automatically, as it were, into the haunts of falsehood and wickedness, and men feel the force of the elenchus, though they were not personally arraigned by the preacher. The Word of God, quick and powerful, penetrates the hearts of men independently of any special aim of its proclaimers; it follows error into its hidden recesses, uncovers its subterfuges, and drives it out of a sheltering ambiguity, and men know that they have been discovered in their lies and shame, though the human instrument in this successful chase may not be conscious of his success.

The Scripture texts cited embrace every essential part of the elenchus. One feature, however, deserves special attention. It was shown that 2 Tim. 3, 15 ff. is primarily addressed to a theologian. God has made it the special duty of the called teachers of the Church to wield the elenchus. It is one of their official functions. In the same epistle (2, 14) Paul urges Timothy to "put his hearers in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." Paul knew the dangers of a wordy warfare, the strife of tongues in theology. He was

no friend of the eristic, the disputatious controversialist, the theological dare-devil to whom controversy is an end in itself. Unprofitable and subversive of faith he calls such practice, but he points the earnest theologian to the profitable elenchus (3, 16) which is a part of Scripture. This elenchus, too, is inspired truth, and Scripture cannot be fully taught without it. Whoever omits this elenchus which the Spirit has put into Scripture robs the Church of a blessing which God has designed for her. Yea, the Spirit of God, who speaks in and through the written Word, Himself is engaged in elenchic work, according to the Lord's promise. "When the Comforter is come," says Christ, "He will reprove (ἐλέγξει) the world." Christ is pointing to the day of Pentecost. When the Spirit was poured out upon the believers, the Church of the New Covenant was dedicated for its great work on earth. The Pentecostal Visitor from on high brought the elenchus. The first apostolical oration was directed against a coarse jest. God proved that He will not be mocked. When Peter had ended his sermon from Joel and the Psalms, there stood before him a smitten assembly of men. They were pricked in their hearts and inquired anxiously: "What shall we do?" Peter had not minced words; he had bluntly charged them with the murder of the innocent Jesus. He had wielded the elenchus with such great force and such good results that three thousand souls professed Christ. Thus the elenchus is connected with the very beginning of the Christian Church, and that it was constantly and deliberately employed throughout the apostolic era, the Acts and Epistles of the apostles witness.

The Word and the Spirit are the informer and guide of the theologian. It is impossible, in a world of error and vice, for a teacher of the Church to follow these heavenly guides and yet avoid using the elenchus. "A bishop," says Paul, "must hold fast the faithful Word, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers" (τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν), Tit. 1, 9. A bishop, then, who does not favor the elenchus is not a bishop after the heart of

God. He incapacitates himself, by his timidity or indifference, for a penetrative study of the Scriptures; his theology will be tinged with doubt and skepticism. For the Word which he is to preach is a faithful, *i. e.*, a sure and reliable Word. If he holds it fast, he is himself assured. In that case there can be no question as to his mode of procedure whenever his teaching is contradicted. His conscience, informed by the Word of God, will not suffer him to remain silent; for the Word bids him speak and "convince the gainsayer." More than this, the faithful Word makes him "able to convince" his opponent. The bishop, then, who on such an occasion prefers a dignified silence to a frank refutation of his opponent, places his carnal wisdom ahead of the wisdom of the Lord. Or if he agrees to forego the use of the elenchus because his opponent declares that that is to him the only objectionable feature, he is a credulous fool who does not see that the opponent objects to the means and mode of attack only because he does not like to be attacked at all.

Paul, moreover, is very explicit in impressing upon the bishop the duty of employing the elenchus. He characterizes the gainsayers with whom Titus is to deal as "unruly," persons who will not submit to any order, heady, "vain talkers and deceivers," "liars, evil beasts." He says that their "mouths must be stopped," v. 11, and they must be "rebuked sharply," ἀποτόμως, v. 13, *i. e.*, without any untimely leniency, promptly and effectually, so that all their subterfuges and pretenses may be cut off. Language like this shows that the elenchus is, indeed, no pleasant affair, neither to him who is using it nor to him against whom it is used.

To cite only one more passage, Paul writes to Timothy: "Preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season, reprove (ἐλεγξον), rebuke (ἐπιτίμησον), exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears," 2 Tim. 4, 2. 3. The two terms which the apostle in this place joins with the com-

mand to employ the elenchus have reference to the manner in which it is to be used. Solemn earnestness, on the one hand, and patient persistence, on the other, should characterize the use of the elenchus. The preacher should reiterate the threatenings of God's righteous anger, and thus shake the false confidence of the sinner, and by repeating and continuing his efforts and presenting the divine doctrine possibly from a new point of view each time, he should endeavor to show the sinner with increasing clearness his error, so that, in the end, the sinner stands convicted, even though he refuses to be convinced. The apostle also names a time when the elenchus is especially applicable and necessary: when sound doctrine is not endured, when teachers arise who adapt their teaching to the fancies of men, tickling either men's reason or their flesh, when error is being preached for truth, or immorality is given shelter within the Church. In such times the elenchus is to be sounded, clear and sharp like a bugle-call to action, that the enemy may be frightened and the secure aroused.

The prophets, Christ and His forerunner, the holy apostles, and all successful teachers of the Church have used the elenchus. It can be shown that periods of keen theological warfare have been seasons of decided inward and outward growth to the Church, while long seasons of peace and ease have been marked by spiritual torpor and decay. When properly employed, the Church has always use for the elenchus. The confessors at Augsburg very decidedly stated what they held in regard to particular doctrines, and did not hesitate to add that their adherents "damnant secus docentes."

Gerhardt had been reared in the faith of the above Scripture and of the confessions which followed the lead of Scripture also with regard to the elenchus. He was not a reckless disputant. The testimony of his contemporaries pictures him as a modest, peace-loving person. Such a person the Christian polemist should ever be. Nor is there anything coarse, any buffoonery, any trickiness, any dragging in of irrelevant matter, any witticisms that are intended to hurt the feelings,—in

short, anything of the nature of carnal weapons discernible in his polemics. He states his dissent calmly and in objective form, but is very decided and unyielding against any unscriptural position that he has begun to combat. He appeals to his opponent's conscience, and he does not shrink from holding up to the opponent the ultimate consequence of his error, — damnation.

The generation of Lutheran theologians of whom Gerhardt was a representative has long passed away, and with them has passed away, as a distinct discipline of theology, that of polemics. Pelt records the change that has come thus: "Meanwhile an irenic spirit had taken the place of the former lust of strife, and this spirit endeavored, especially since the publication of Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, to do justice to an opponent. This accounts for the movement which arose to exhibit scientifically the peculiar mode of reasoning of the various churches as seen in their confessions. These efforts have developed, since Bernh. v. Sanden, Walch, Fr. Boerner, and others, into the science of symbolical theology, which latter began to drain polemics of its heart blood, until the younger discipline, known as History of Dogma, arose, and completely finished polemics, causing it to disappear almost entirely." (Herzog, R. E. 11, 793.) This is true, in the main. There have still been polemicists in the Church, and even textbooks on polemics have been written as late as our present age. But polemical theology of the type of the Reformation era is distinctly under popular disfavor. A new sort of polemics has arisen, and strange to say, is indulged in just by such theologians as pose as representatives of a liberal Richtung. As between the two brands, we very much prefer the old kind, with its rugged plainness, its straightforward attack, and scrupulous application of Scripture. And just from a theologian like Gerhardt our age may learn how to avoid the two extremes in polemical theology, viz., to sin neither *in excessu* nor *in defectu*.

WARTBURG LETTERS OF LUTHER.

*(Continued.)*TO MELANCHTHON.¹⁾

To Mr. Philip Melanchthon, the faithful servant of Christ and evangelist of the church at Wittenberg.

Jesus.

Grace! I have disliked your letter in a twofold respect: firstly, because I notice that you are bearing your cross with too great impatience, and that you give way too much to your emotions and are too tender-hearted, as usual; secondly, because you exalt me far too much and are egregiously mistaken in attributing to me such great things, for you assume that I am greatly concerned about God's cause. Your high opinion of me confuses and vexes me; for, alas! I am sitting here impassive and hardened in idleness. I am praying little; I am not groaning at all for the Church of God; on the contrary, I am burning with a great fire of my untamed flesh. To be brief, while I ought to be fervent in the spirit, I am fervent in the flesh through evil lust, laziness, idleness, drowsiness, and I do not know but what God has forsaken me, because you are not praying for me.²⁾ You take my place now, more eminently gifted by God and comelier than I.

It is now eight days that I have not written anything, nor prayed, nor studied, partly because of buffetings of the flesh, partly because I have been tormented by other grievances. If this condition is not improved I must needs go to Erfurt in

1) See MS. in Cod. Jen. b, f. 6; in Cod. Solger. Dresd. C. 351, fol. 28 b (much mutilated); MS. 1393, fol. 39, in the royal library at Copenhagen. It was published by Aurifaber I, 334 b, De Wette II, 21, in Erlang. Corresp. III, 189. St. Louis Ed. XV, 2528. Prof. Hoppe notes that the text of the letter has suffered many mutilations.

2) It is over statements like these that Romanists of the Denifle school have gloated, reading into them a confession of gross carnality, while the scope of Luther is plainly this to deprecate praise, of which he was never fond, and in declining which he would sometimes, by a well-known law of the mind, permit his utterances to run to the opposite extreme. Moreover, he has specified the evil lust of which he complains.

broad daylight.³⁾ There you will see me, or I shall see you; for I shall there consult physicians or surgeons. For it is impossible for me to bear this affliction longer.⁴⁾ I could more easily suffer ten large wounds than this slight indication⁵⁾ of a lesion. It may be, too, that the Lord oppresses me thus for the purpose of hurrying me out of the wilderness into the public.

I shall not reply to Emser;⁶⁾ let some else reply whom you consider suited for the task, maybe Amsdorf. However, he may be too good to be mired with this dirt.

I have resolved to translate your Apology⁷⁾ against the asses at Paris together with their insane stuff into German and to add my comment. I should greatly like to see Oecolampad's Treatise on Confession translated among you, in order that the papists may burst (with rage).

I am at work on my German Gospel-Postils, and shall promptly forward them to the press as soon as I shall have finished ten (sermons).

Since all is well with you, you have no need of me at all. And I am angry with you, because you are loading yourself with such great labors and will not listen when told that you must spare yourself. In this you allow your stubbornness to guide you. How often have I been dinning this into your ears! But just as often I have been telling a story to a deaf man.

As regards the authority of the sword, I still hold the same opinion as formerly.⁸⁾ I have the impression that you

3) The plague having broken out at Erfurt, Luther was prevented from carrying out his resolution.

4) See THEOL. QUARTERLY, vol. X, 59.

5) Prof. Hoppe proposes *indicium* for *judicium*.

6) Emser in his "Quadruplica" had attacked Luther. The latter in the end did reply, since no one was found willing to assume this task for him. See "Refutation of his error," etc. St. Louis Ed. XVIII, Intro., p. 41.

7) St. Louis Ed. XVIII, 960. Luther's translation of the *Determinatio* of the Parisians with a preface and epilogue at the same place, col. 932.

8) Luther here replies to the question which had been propounded to him, viz., whether the authority of the sword, or the civil magistrates, could be substantiated from the Gospel. Melancthon had denied this. Luther, as will be seen, holds that the Gospel approves and sanctions secular authority, but does not ordain it.

desire to be shown from the Gospel either a command or a suggestion in regard to this matter. I fully agree with you that an authority of this kind is neither commanded nor suggested in the Gospel, nor would it be at all proper (that either should have been done), inasmuch as the Gospel is a law to the willing and the free, who have nothing to do with the sword, or the authority of the sword.

But, on the other hand, this authority is not forbidden either, but rather confirmed and lauded, something that we do not read with regard to matters which are merely tolerated. For fasts and outward ceremonies are not commanded nor suggested in the Gospel, nor any concern about temporal affairs. Nor would it have been proper for the Gospel to make disposition regarding these matters, since it guides only the spirit in (the exercise of) his liberty. However, does this authority exist to the end that we should not make use of it? Yea, do not the exigencies of life require an authority of this sort and also its use?

Your argument would, indeed, apply beautifully, if all obeyed the Gospel. For inasmuch as the wicked are necessarily in the majority, how long would the Church subsist in this world, if the sword were withdrawn, since on account of the unbridled license of the wicked no one can be secure in the enjoyment of his life and possessions? However, you desire to be convinced not with arguments and statements based on certain improprieties which might possibly arise, but with Scripture.

I have stated before that, like many other things, the sword is neither commanded nor suggested, and yet it is extolled and confirmed, just as the right of marriage, which does not concern the Gospel either. For here you have John Baptist instructing the soldiers and saying: "Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your wages," Luke 3, 14. Assuredly, if these people had no right to the power of the sword, he would have had to forbid its use to them; for they really put the same question which you pro-

pound, when they asked: "What shall we do?" Here you have, not the institution indeed, but the sanction of the military order. Don't you think that it will be much more difficult for you to reply to those who cite this passage against you than for them to make answer to you? Paul commands us 1 Tim. 2, 1 ff. to pray for those who are in authority, in accordance with the example of Jeremiah who commands the Jews (ch. 29, 7) to pray for the king of the Babylonians, and does not order them to pray against authorities as against something that either is forbidden or has no right of existence.

But you object: Those people were pagans. However, the prayer offered for them⁹⁾ was not to the effect that they might become believers, but that the Jews might be and remain at peace with them. You will not persuade me to believe that the apostles and prophets could have enjoined prayer for things which we may only suffer and tolerate. Else we should pray for robbers and, as you put it, for unrighteous tyrants, asking that they stay unrighteous.

Now, I shall not suffer you to reject Rom. 13, 1 ff. and 1 Pet. 2, 13,¹⁰⁾ claiming that they do not apply here and are meant merely as an instruction to subjects. This you shall not accomplish, Philip. These are God's words, and they express a great truth when they state: The powers that be are of God, and he resists the ordinance of God who resists the powers that be, and they are the ministers of God. You will not find proof to show that these words were spoken in reference to matters that are merely tolerated.

He is not a minister of God, but an enemy, who does injustice or imposes whatever he can on the patience of men, nor is anything that is merely suffered to exist a minister of God. It is one thing that we find recorded that He has excited one nation to war¹¹⁾ against the other, 2 Chron. 15, 6; Matt. 24, 7, *e. g.*, the king of Babylon against Tyre, and that He

9) *Orabatur* for *orabat* in MS. — Prof. H.

10) Instead of 1 Pet. 3, 13 in all editions. — Prof. H.

11) Prof. H. adopts De Wette's suggestion of *ad bellum* for *bellum*.

calls him His servant, Ezek. 26; Jer. 27, 6, and says that He "hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes," Jer. 51, 11. And it is quite another thing when we are told, Rom. 13 and 1 Tim. 2, that the powers that be are ordained for the sake of peace. For here we are told¹²⁾ that they have been ordained to imbue men with fear when they do evil, and for the praise of them that do well; while in the former passages we are told that they are appointed for vengeance and to balance accounts for an evil work that has already been perpetrated.

Now what will you do when you read that Abraham, David, and the ancient saints have made the best use of the power of the sword, men of whom we are certain that they were of evangelical mind? Although they used it only for a time,¹³⁾ it is certainly not a pious act for people of an evangelical mind to place their interdict on the use of a matter which those men employed in a laudable manner, namely, the right to use the sword, all the more because it is neither revoked nor forbidden in the Gospel, but, as I stated, has been sanctioned, at least in behalf of such as were believers, namely, the soldiers who made inquiry of John.

Now, since Christ in the Gospel had to ordain divine and heavenly matters, it is small wonder that He did not ordain the power of the sword, which can easily be ordained by human creatures, and that meanwhile He treats it so as to show that, if it did not militate against the Gospel for Him to ordain it, He would have ordained it, since He praises and sanctions it now that it has been ordained, yea, He plainly teaches that it has been ordained by God.

Moreover, Peter (2. Ep. 2, 10) and Jude (v. 8) are indignant, because governments and dignities are being despised by Antichrist. Now, may we not despise unbridled license and unjust practices that are merely tolerated? But God requires

12) *dicitur* for *dicat*. — Prof. H.

13) In the editions cited the preceding clause is brought to a close at this place.

that to the institution named we should show honor and reverence; does He require the same for godless matters which are merely tolerated?

I am caught in these passages of Scripture, Philip, and should not know what to answer. Your view of this matter gives me much less satisfaction than mine ought to give you. You can cite no passage which rejects or interdicts or instructs us to flee secular government in any way whatsoever. I find it confirmed and praised in many ways, and represented as an institution that we should honor and commend to God in prayer, only its use is not directly commanded or suggested in the Gospel, just like marriage, family affairs, home discipline, town-rule, or any other government or management of temporal affairs.

Communicate to me if you receive light on this matter in any other way, but do it in such a manner as to prove that secular government is forbidden, that we must eschew it, or that it is merely tolerated. For Christ has said that power was given to Pilate from above, John 19, 11, I hold, however, that the statement in this place must be interpreted to mean that God does not bestow His gifts for an evil purpose. But let this suffice.

I congratulate Amsdorf on the increase of his revenue,¹⁴⁾ but still more because he is now fortunately to furnish an apostle. Now ye are full, ye reign as kings without us, 1 Cor. 4, 8, and I do not see why you should miss me so much, and in what respect you should be in need of my labors. It seems to me you are borrowing trouble,¹⁵⁾ for your affairs are in a better condition now that I am absent than when I was with you: you are lecturing, Amsdorf is lecturing, and Jonas is about to lecture.¹⁶⁾ Pray, would you have the kingdom of God to be proclaimed to you people alone? Must not the Gospel

14) Amsdorf had been elected pastor at Schmoelln, near Altenburg.

15) du scheinst dir selbst Gedanken zu machen.

16) Jonas had not yet arrived at Wittenberg to assume his professorship. See THEOL. QUARTERLY, vol. X, 188, note 6.

be brought to others also? Is your Antioch unwilling to furnish neither a Silas, nor a Paul, nor a Barnabas for some work of the Spirit? Acts 15, 34 f.

I tell you, although I should very much like to be with you, still in view of your present abundance I should not regard it as a hardship if the Lord graciously were to grant me a door for His Word either at Erfurt or at Cologne or elsewhere. Consider, pray, what a great harvest there is everywhere and that there are no laborers, Matt. 9, 37; you, however, are all laborers. We must surely consider, not ourselves, but our brethren who are scattered everywhere, lest we live unto ourselves, that is, unto the devil, and not unto Christ.

Accordingly, let us be careful not to be too carnally minded toward one another and to seek the presence of the body more than that of the Spirit. I am ready to go whithersoever the Lord wills, either to you or to some other place. As regards my return, I know nothing at all. You know with whom that rests.

Spalatin writes me that by order of the prince that part of the theses which treats confession was not debated, whereat I am quite extraordinarily displeased. I beseech you in the future always to anticipate the schemes which are being forged at the court, and do not follow them, as I have done heretofore. If I had followed their advice, not half of what has been done would have been accomplished. Those people are men just like we are.

I shall argue this matter with Spalatin. These things inflate our opponents and make them stubborn; moreover, they show that we are timid. Farewell! Somebody promised to carry this letter which I had just finished writing, but the party did not keep his promise. Pray for me, all of you, I beseech you; for I am being merged in sins in this solitude. From my wilderness, 1521, on St. Margaret's Day.¹⁷⁾

MARTIN LUTHER, *Eremité.*

(To be continued.)

17) July 13.